**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-205
Wednesday
25 October 1989

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-89-205* CONTENTS *25 October 1989*

## ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Grinevskiy Discusses Verification at Vienna Talks *[TASS]* ..... 1
Soltan Examines NATO's Nuclear Policy *[Moscow International]* ..... 1

## WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Conducts 24 Oct Press Briefing ..... 2
    Vorontsov Meeting With PLO Figures *[TASS]* ..... 2
    Official Visits to Finland, Poland, U.S. *[TASS]* ..... 2
    Narcotics Trade in Afghanistan *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 2
'Roundtable' Cites Finland, CFE Talks, Pacific Area *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 3
Petrovskiy Discusses UN General Assembly Debate ..... 8
    'Post-Confrontational' Session *[TASS]* ..... 8
    'Encouraging Tone' Seen *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* ..... 8
    Peace-Making Potential Being Realized *[TASS]* ..... 9
United Nations Discusses Central America Situation *[TASS]* ..... 9
Ryzhkov Greets Arctic Conference With Canada *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 10
Council of Europe Delegation Visits Moscow *[TASS]* ..... 10
Conference on Third World Ends, Results Discussed *[TASS]* ..... 10
'Intermosbank' To Concentrate on Joint Enterprises *[Moscow TV]* ..... 11
USSR Rejoins World Psychiatric Association *[TASS]* ..... 11

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

### United States & Canada

Primakov-Led Delegation Leaves for United States *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 12
IZVESTIYA Details Jackson Hole Accords *[23 Oct]* ..... 12
Moscow Radio on Baker's San Francisco Speech *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 13
Soviet Relief Team Flies to San Francisco *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* ..... 13

### Northeast Asia

Afanasyev's Remarks at Tokyo Symposium Refuted *[Moscow International]* ..... 15
Soviet-Japanese Ties Evaluated on Anniversary *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* ..... 15

### Near East & South Asia

Israel's Novik on Preparations for Peres Visit *[Moscow International]* ..... 16
PLO's 'Abbas Interviewed on Peace Process *[TASS]* ..... 16
Al-Ta'if Accord on Lebanon Welcomed *[Timoshkin on Moscow International]* ..... 17
Afghan Rebel Plans To Stop Aid Convoys Criticized *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* ..... 18
Sudan Federation Proposal Assessed *[Moscow International]* ..... 18
Indian Troop Pullout From Sri Lanka Hailed *[Demichev on Moscow International]* ..... 18

### Sub-Saharan Africa

TASS Interviews SWAPO's Nujoma on Namibia ..... 19
Situation at 'Crucial Moment' for Namibia Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* ..... 20
Army's Lizichev on Working Visit in Tanzania ..... 20
    Departure 22 Oct *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct]* ..... 20
    Arrival in Dar-es-Salaam *[TASS]* ..... 20

### East Europe

Shevardnadze Arrives in Poland, Meets Leaders .... 21
  Confers With Mazowiecki *[TASS]* .... 21
  Talks With Skubiszewski *[Warsaw TV]* .... 21
  Received by Rakowski *[TASS]* .... 22
  Received by Jaruzelski *[TASS]* .... 22
Moscow TV Reports on Mass Demonstrations in GDR .... 22
Supreme Soviet Presidium Congratulates Krenz *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* .... 23
Krenz Election as Head of State Council Reported *[TASS]* .... 23
  Further on Krenz Election Speech *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Oct]* .... 23
IZVESTIYA Reports on GDR Public Debates *[24 Oct]* .... 24
Lack of Single Supplier Affects GDR Cooperation *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* .... 25
Hungarian Republic Proclaimed; Marches Continue *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* .... 27
  Proclamation of Republic Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Oct]* .... 27
Hungarian Democratic Front Leader Cited *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* .... 28
Correspondent on Hungarian 1956 Anniversary Fete *[Moscow TV]* .... 29
Role of Hungarian State Council 'Enhanced' *[TRUD 21 Oct]* .... 30
Delays in Rail Deliveries From CSSR Explained *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* .... 30
Freight Trains for USSR Held at PPR-GDR Border *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* .... 31

### West Europe

NATO Ministers Welcome Shevardnadze Statement *[TASS]* .... 31
Gorbachev Begins Official Visit to Finland .... 32
  Departure for Helsinki *[Moscow Radio]* .... 32
  President Koivisto's Welcome *[TASS]* .... 32
  Talks With Koivisto Begin .... 32
Media, Officials Preview Gorbachev Finland Visit .... 32
  Gorbachev Foreword to Book Presented *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* .... 32
  Helsinki News Conference Held *[TASS]* .... 33
  TASS Assesses Ties .... 34
  Yakovlev Interviewed on Relations *[Helsinki International]* .... 34
  'Open in-Depth' Talks Predicted *[TASS]* .... 35
  IZVESTIYA Sets Scene *[25 Oct]* .... 35
  Finnish Foreign Minister on Visit *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* .... 36
Vatican Official Cited on Gorbachev Visit to Italy *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* .... 37
Ground Forces Chief Varennikov Leaves for Norway *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct]* .... 37

### Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Grants Interview to PRAVDA *[23 Oct]* .... 37
PRAVDA on End of Arms Supplies to Nicaragua *[22 Oct]* .... 39
Nicaragua's Tinoco on Contras' Disbandment *[TASS]* .... 40
U.S. Policy Toward Cuba, Central America Hit *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* .... 40
Soviet Friendship Award for Cuban Official *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* .... 41

## NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Supreme Soviet Session

23 Oct Supreme Soviet Session on Moscow TV .... 42
Moscow TV Carries 24 Oct Supreme Soviet Session .... 51
  1600 GMT .... 51
  1720 GMT .... 53
  1754 GMT .... 54
  1906 GMT .... 55
Comments at 24 Oct Supreme Soviet .... 56
  Yeltsin on Elections *[Moscow TV]* .... 56
  Vorotnikov on Power Structure *[Moscow TV]* .... 56
Supreme Soviet Approves Amendments on Elections *[TASS]* .... 56

Defense Committee Debates Border Security *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Oct]* ........ 57
Kryuchkov Discusses Border Guards *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* ........ 58
Supreme Soviet Interest Groups Viewed *[Moscow International]* ........ 59

**Political & Social**

Gorbachev Speech to PRAVDA Editors Televised *[Moscow TV]* ........ 60
Ligachev Interviewed on Perestroyka, Party *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 42]* ........ 65
Abalkin Urges Soviets To 'Get Down To Work' *[TASS]* ........ 72
Gorbachev Praises Miners on Avoiding Strike *[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]* ........ 72
Yakovlev Chairs Commission To Examine Repressions *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* ........ 73
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Begins Session 25 Oct *[TASS]* ........ 74
    Electoral System To Be Debated *[TASS]* ........ 74
Kazakov Relieved From RSFSR Post *[TASS]* ........ 74
Further on RSFSR People's Front *[TASS]* ........ 74
RSFSR Deputies, Voters Establish 'Club' *[TASS]* ........ 75
Moscow Radio Anniversary; Changes Foreseen *[TASS]* ........ 75
Republics' Foreign Policy Roles To Expand *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIA 13 Oct]* ........ 76
New USSR People's Deputies Elected 15 Oct *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* ........ 77
Zaykov, Belousov Attend Moscow Party Aktiv Session *[Moscow TV]* ........ 77
Ukraine's Ivashko on National Minority Issue *[Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP 20 Oct]* ........ 77
Ukraine Groups Oppose Russian as State Language *[LITERATURNAYA UKRAINA 12 Oct]* ........ 78
Former Rukh Leader Comments on Split in Group *[Moscow International]* ........ 79
Armenian Supreme Soviet Postpones 27 Oct Session *[Yerevan Radio]* ........ 79
Armenia Blockade Reportedly Persists in New Form *[Yerevan Radio]* ........ 80
    Armed Protection for Trains Increased *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* ........ 80
Grants Paid to Azerbaijanis in Armenia *[TASS]* ........ 80
MVD Officer on Troops Deployed in Troublespots *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 25 Oct]* ........ 80
Ministry Official MVD Troops Anniversary *[Moscow Radio]* ........ 81
Kazakh Workers Oppose Semipalatinsk Tests *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ........ 82
Estonian Official on Opposition to New Laws *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 5 Oct]* ........ 82
Colonel Lauds Balts' Perestroyka Efforts *[TIESA 26 Aug]* ........ 85
Opposing Views Aired at Nationalities Roundtable *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 16 Sep]* ........ 86
Adoption of Social Democracy Ideas Urged *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* ........ 91
Bogomolov Argues for Undogmatic Socialism *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Oct]* ........ 94

**Economic**

Prospects for Free Economic Zones Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* ........ 98
Economic Conference Continues, Attendees Listed *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* ........ 100
Union of Managers Established, Elects Officials *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Oct]* ........ 101
Goskomstat Chairman Reviews Economic Situation *[TASS]* ........ 101
Demidov Criticizes Food Shortages in Moscow *[TRUD 22 Oct]* ........ 102
Gosbank Begins Issuing Credit Cards *[Moscow International]* ........ 102
Promising New Gas Field Discovered in Turkmenistan *[Ashkabad Radio]* ........ 102

**Scientific**

'Meteor-3' Meteorological Satellite Launched *[TASS]* ........ 102
'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Space Flight 24 Oct *[TASS]* ........ 103
Booster Rocket Testing Scheduled for Pacific Area *[TASS]* ........ 103

**Military**

New Union To Provide Social Aid to Servicemen *[Moscow Radio]* ........ 103
Army Deputies' Group Holds First Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]* ........ 104
Meeting With Afghan Veterans' Widows, Mothers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct]* ........ 105

Internal Troops Lauded on Anniversary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* ........ 106
Further Details Cited on Caspian Plane Crash
*[Shaposhnikov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Oct]* ........ 107

## Grinevskiy Discusses Verification at Vienna Talks

*LD2410192489 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—The recent third round of Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe was described by head of the Soviet delegation Oleg Grinevskiy as an information and verification session.

Speaking at a briefing here today, Grinevskiy stressed that verification is the pivotal issue in securing confidence that all the parties will fulfil the agreement.

In Vienna, the Soviet delegation proposed, on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty delegations, a simple, reliable and economical verification system.

Under this system, the verification procedure would cover the following—the initial data included in the signed agreement, the data as specified for the moment of entry of the agreement into force, the agreed end levels and sublevels, the process proper of the arms reduction and elimination, the temporary facilities for storing arms due for scrapping, and the process of disbanding military units.

On-site inspection must provide, along with technical means, the basic tools for verification of the fulfillment of the treaty provisions.

Much in the Soviet document echoes provisions advanced by NATO at the end of September, he said. This enables fast and effective progress in this direction.

Grinevskiy called attention to the Soviet proposal for stabilizing measures to preclude suprise attacks and increase openness and predictability in Europe.

This proposal envisions a range of measures to restrict the scale of military exercises in Europe, the call-up of reservists, and the concentration and movement of troops and arms.

"An important, if not the central focus," Grinevskiy noted, "is a restructuring of conventional armed forces and a reduction of their offensive capabilities. This means fewer highly mobile units in the advanced groupings, taking away means of landing and transfer, and relocation of units armed with offensive weapons".

By the end of the round, Grinevskiy said, the parties agreed on the draft treaty's definition of artillery systems.

Under the agreement, reduction will involve all NATO and WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] artillery systems whose caliber equals or exceeds 100 millimeters, i.e. guns, howitzers, mortars and multiple rocket launchers.

A list of each side's more than forty artillery system of this kind has also been agreed.

At the same time the Soviet diplomat noted that "Much more could have been done during the round". There were opportunities for making progress on tanks, armoured vehicles and helicopters.

Our partners let these opportunities slip as they were simply unprepared to deal with the issues. The Warsaw Treaty member-states declared they were prepared to reduce their tank force by 40,000 combat tanks. This proposal, beneficial to all parties, has not been realized so far because NATO seeks to withhold from reduction several hundreds of its light tanks. They view these tanks as a promising weapon, which they aim to update and expand, Grinevskiy believed.

"The present situation at the talks," he said in conclusion, "calls for accelerating the negotiation process. The top leaders of the NATO and WTO countries agreed last summer about the need to conclude Vienna talks within 1900.

"To meet this deadline, the fourth round must be decisive. We are looking forward to NATO's response to our proposals concerning air forces, personnel, information, verification and stabilization", Grinevskiy stressed.

## Soltan Examines NATO's Nuclear Poliy

*LD2410210689 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[commentary by Yuriy Soltan]

[Text] NATO's nuclear planning group has begun its autumn session in Portugal's seaside place of Quinta do Lago, with analysis of the Alliance's nuclear policy in the light of current changes in Europe and worldwide placed topmost on the agenda. Is NATO's nuclear policy likely to change? Commentary is by Yuriy Soltan.

NATO officials have increasingly spoken of the need for a review of the nuclear deterrent strategy and for abandoning some of its crucial elements. It is expected that the defense ministers will now instruct their experts to look into the opinion of restructuring the alliance's nuclear forces and their possible reduction in the future. The question is one of the short-range nuclear weapons. Although NATO leaders find it increasingly hard to cling to their strategy from past positions it (?will) be too soon yet to speak of NATO'S renunciation of nuclear deterrence.

The American secretary of state, James Baker, was quoted as saying in San Francisco on 23 September that the Alliance could not send nuclear weapons or the need to maintain nuclear deterrence into oblivion. For the time being Western countries have no intention of starting talks on short-range nuclear weapons. Their position was reaffirmed at Monday's meeting in Paris by the American and French defense ministers. A high-ranking NATO official said on the eve of the session in Portugal that the Soviet Union must cut more nuclear arms in Europe because of its substantial superiority in that category of weapons. Incidentally there exists a near parity between the two alliances when it comes to total numbers of nuclear weapons.

Nonetheless, the Soviet Union is withdrawing unilaterally 500 of its short-range nuclear warheads from Eastern Europe. It is prepared to pull out more, provided NATO agrees to immediate talks on that category of weapons. The question arising in this country is whether or not it is making unilateral concessions. Although part of the truth is there, disarmament is not one-way traffic. What is needed is mutual concessions and a balance of interests. It is to be hoped that this element of the new thinking may becomne a leading one in NATO's policy as well.

## Perfilyev Conducts 24 Oct Press Briefing

### Vorontsov Meeting With PLO Figures

*LD2410153889 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—In a meeting at the Soviet Foreign Ministry today, Soviet First Deputy Minister Yuliy Vorontsov and two members of the PLO Executive Committee, Mahmud 'Abbas and Mahmud Darvish, discussed various aspects of the Middle East situation and prospects for settling the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today that the sides informed each other about active efforts by the USSR and the Palestine Liberation Organisation to promote comprehensive approaches to preparations for and holding of an international conference on the Middle East.

It was noted that all sides concerned should display political flexibility and realism and look for compromise solutions to emerging problems on the basis of the balance of interests.

Vorontsov stressed the importance of preserving and strengthening positive prerequisites for the start of peace process in the Middle East with the participation of the PLO, the recongnised representative of the Palestinian people.

He highly assessed the PLO's constructive policy and practical steps towards reaching a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict and a fair solution of the Palestinian problem.

The Soviet Union and the PLO reaffirmed their intention to develop close coordination and cooperation in the interests of lasting peace in the region.

Both sides condemned Israeli repressive actions in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Perfilyev said that consultations within the framework of the Soviet-Palestinian committee on the Middle East were also held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

### Official Visits to Finland, Poland, U.S.

*LD2410165489 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev will be accompanied during his forthcoming visit to Finland by Aleskandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Konstantin Katushev, minister for foreign economic relations of the USSR, Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, Vajno Vaelaes, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party's Central Committee, Boris Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad regional party committee, and Boris Aristov, Soviet ambassador to Finland.

This was announced at a briefing here today by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev.

During the official visit to Poland, started today, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will meet with the Polish foreign minister, with Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki and President Wojciech Jaruzelski.

Upon the completion of the visit Shevardnadze will take part in a session of the Warsaw treaty foreign ministers' committee.

An official delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet will leave for the United States on Wednesday at the invitation of the U.S. Senate democratic majority leader George Mitchell and the republican minority leader Robert Dole.

The Soviet parliamentary delegation is led by Yevgeniy Primakov, alternate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

The Soviet parliamentarians will meet congressmen and representatives of the U.S. Administration in Washington and will also visit the states of Maine, Kansas, California and New York, Perfiliyev said.

The sides will exchange views on the whole range of Soviet- American relations and will expand on the sides' intentions to broaden contacts and exchanges.

### Narcotics Trade in Afghanistan

*LD2410182189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Around 800 tonnes of opium are currently being produced annually in the areas of Afghanistan which are under the control of the opposition, Perfilyev, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration [title as heard], has said in a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. He went on to say:

[Begin Perfilyev recording] A number of commanders of opposition groups have virtually become leaders of the narcotics business and are engaged in the production and delivery of narcotics to Pakistan. It is known that there exist in Pakistan around 200 underground factories for processing opium which use mainly raw material supplied by the Afghan mujahidin. One of the largest factories in the world for the production of heroin belongs to the Islamic Party of Afghanistan of Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, who receives the lion's share of U.S. military aid to the mujahidin. The narcotics syndicates are well armed through supplies of up-to-date U.S. weapons. The narcotics business has become an integral part of the war that the mujahidin are waging from the territory of Pakistan, and this is one of the main reasons why the opposition leaders are interested in maintaining a situation of instability in the area of the Afghan-Pakistani border, and throughout Afghanistan, too.

At a time when the issue of a campaign against drug addiction—which has become the real plague of the 20th century—is confronting the United States, Western Europe, and the whole world so acutely, the continuing support for mujahidin groupings is increasingly turning into support for a drugs mafia. To be more precise, the support being rendered to the interim government of the opposition which has been set up in Pakistan is, in practice, turning into support for the local kingpins of the narcotics business who are participating in the government. None of the admonishments to the Mujahidin leaders—who are already have a taste for drugs dollars—are heeded and neither will they renounce this super-profitable business.

The issue of halting the production and export of narcotics can only be resolved in conditions of peace in Afghanistan, which can only be achieved through national reconciliation and the establishment of a coalition government representing the interests of all Afghan political forces and the whole Afghan people. Indeed, if such serious measures are not adopted, then even if it proves possible somehow to restrict the flow of narcotics from other regions, they might be replacd by the narcotics from this region.[end Recording]

## 'Roundtable' Cites Finland, CFE Talks, Pacific Area

*LD2210194989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 22 Oct 89*

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov; and All-Union Radio foreign policy commentators Nikolay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners! At the microphone is Boris Andrianov. We are about to start our Sunday program "International Observers at the Roundtable." Taking part in it it today are my colleagues Nikolay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin—both foreign commentators for All-Union Radio.

I shall permit myself to break with the traditional formula for these meetings, where we usually examine events of the past week, and to start with a topic that is at the center of attention of the world community and the mass media—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Finland. I should remind you that it starts on 25 October. Relations between our states are not infrequently—and, it should be said, quite rightly—described as a model of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

[Agayants] As I see it, it should be particularly stressed that the basis for these relations is the Treaty of Friendshp, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance that was signed after World War II in 1948. Three times since then it has been renewed, and today it serves as a graphic and persuasive example of complete equality, respect for sovereignty, and understanding of the realities of the modern day world.

[Vedenyapin] That is all very true, Nikolay Ivanovich. The only thing is that I should not like our listeners to gain the impression that Soviet-Finish relations have proceeded along a well-smoothed road throughout these past 41 years. That it's been nothing but peace, tranquility and heavenly harmony, so to speak.

Not everything has been as cloudless and ideal as one would like—not by a long shot. But as regards the 1948 Treaty, it has unquestionably stood the test of time. Whatever attitude you take toward it today; however critically you examine and assess it, all the same it does demonstrate its viability and confirms just how well-grounded it is. That, I believe, is an indisputable fact.

[Andrianov] The positive advances occurring in the world that are based on the new political mentality in the Soviet Union's foreign policy open up fairly good prospects for an intensification and all-around development of Soviet-Finnish cooperation. For it to be raised to a qualitatively new level. Of course the upcoming visit to Finland by Comrade Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, will provide a positive fillup to this process. It will continue the tradition of summit meetings, whose significance for the overall process it would be hard to overstate. It will be a demonstration of friendship, said Finnish President Mauno Koivisto, in an interview. Stability, continuity and predictability are not pretty turns of phrase, but definite and actual attribtues of our relations, he said.

[Agayants] Yes, the world is changing. Our countries—and the relations between them—cannot stand apart from these changes. New regional dimensions for the existing Soviet-Finnish links and contacts are appearing in econmics, the scientific and cultural sphere, and in other fields of human activity. As the two sides see it, ecological issues require particular attention and a profound and vigorous approach. All these matters will undoubtedly be focused upon at the upcoming Soviet-Finnish summit talks.

[Vedenyapin] It is supposed that another 5-year trade agreement will be signed during comrade Gorbachev's visit to the country known as Suomen. Presumably the protocol that has been drawn up following lengthy contacts on the development on the Kola Peninsula, of cooperation in many branches of the economy, science and technology, will be confirmed. This cooperation is a subject of keen interest, both in the Soviet Union and Finland.

[Andrianov] Furthermore, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, it is expected that there will be an agreed regulation of the directions cooperation should take in the long-term future, in particular in such spheres as science, technology, and environmental protection. Many new agreements on the establishment of joint enterprises are to be signed. In other words, we are talking about a wide range of very important and most diverse problems.

[Agayants] You know, Boris Vasilyevich, I would draw attention to Finnish President Mauno Koivisto, when he said that our interaction is becoming more and more Europized, as he phrased it. In other words, it is assuming a civilized nature which, alas, was clearly lacking in the past. For, once we start participating in the creation of a pan-European home, and once we advocate the broad introduction of the new political thinking into all spheres of our activity, then of course it is quite simply essential for us to take account of the realities and requirements of the present day.

[Vedenyapin] As a result of the lengthy joint work and the searches undertaken over several decades, economic relations between our states have become extremely broad. For a long time now the Soviet Union has been one of Finland's main trade partners. However, there have been flaws in what would appear to be a well-oiled machinery. There have been hiccups caused by the movement of fuel prices: An imbalance has arisen in foreign trade. To be fair, it should be said that this has affected not just Finland, but several socialist countries, too, including Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The situation has been rectified, and the prerequisites are being created for continued fruitful trading between the USSR and Finland. The expectation is that the 5-year agreement that is to be signed next week in Helsinki will guarantee the existing volume of trade traffic.

[Andrianov] If we are to speak of the long-term prospects, then it is quite clear that the economic reform being carried out in the Soviet union will place fresh demands on Soviet-Finnish trade, but, as Mauno Koivisto has remarked, it also presents fresh opportunities, opens up fresh vistas for cooperation, and engenders fresh hopes.

[Agayants] Let's not jump the gun, Boris Vasilyevich. Let's wait and see. The visit is scheduled for 3 days, during which there will be intensive meetings and talks. Important documents are expected to be adopted. Let us reserve the chance to return to this topic in the future, when we can use facts to analyze the situation and draw the necessary conclusions. For the time being, we should again emphasize that the Soviet leader's imminent visit to neighboring Finland is at the center of attention not just of the Suomen public, but of the whole world.

[Andrianov] Among the events of the past week, I would single out the keynote speech by James Baker, the U.S. Secretary of State, to members of the Foreign Policy Association in New York. Today the United States and the USSR really do have the historic opportunity to achieve a stable improvement in their relations, the U.S. secretary of state said.

[Vedenyapin] Well there you are, what I would call a telling statement. Many U.S. observers see this speech by this highly placed administration official as one of the present U.S. leadership's most serious attempts to analyze the state of Soviet-U.S. relations and the prospects for their development at the present stage.

[Andrianov] Essentially that is what it was. I should note that Soviet-U.S. relations have been improving ever since 1985, when perestroyka got under way in our country. The head of the U.S. foreign policy department stressed that these transformations had been the Soviet Union's response to a rapidly changing world. The very nature of perestroyka, said Baker, extends far beyond purely domestic problems. It is bound up with the new mentality in foreign policy. We have an opportunity to leave behind us the postwar Cold War period, with all its ups and downs.

[Agayants] I would remind you that, in his New York speech to the members of the Foreign Policy Association, the U.S. secretary of state singled out five directions the search for Soviet-U.S. rapprochement should go in. Paramount among these, the Bush administration believes, are the European problems. The second area in which mutual understanding between the United States and the USSR should be sought, Baker believes, is in settling regional conflicts. Also mentioned was cooperation in reducing the risk of an outbreak of war, the development of dialogue on global problems—primarily in the realm of the environment—and the possibility of offering the Soviet Union technological assistance in certain areas of our economic reform. In short, this was a very interesting and constructive speech by the U.S. secretary of state, which shows that gradually, in the relations betwen the two great powers, the obstacles dating from the infamous Cold War are being cleared away to reveal a desire to resolve the complex problems existing in the world. These advances can only be welcomed.

[Vedenyapin] Following on from that, I would mention something else rather unusual that the head of the U.S. foreign policy department had to say. On the subject of the program to resolve European problems, Baker said in particular that it provides for an agreement on reducing conventional armed forces and weapons to be drawn up more rapidly. From the point of view of the secretary of state, this will allow the asymmetry that persists to be rectified and the risk of a sudden attack to be reduced—it is for that passage that I cite the secretary of state—and will help perestroyka in the Soviet Union, since it will enable vast material resources to be conserved.

To be sure, it is quite unthinkable that such a thing could have been heard from a spokesman for the U.S. Administration, even quite recently.

[Andrianov] The third round of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, which came to an end this week is being described as very highly productive. One might say that the first unit of the complex structure of the future treaty has been put in place. The participants in the Vienna forum—the Warsaw Pact and NATO states—succeeded in agreeing on a definition of artillery, which will form a component part of the future agreement.

[Vedenyapin] As is known, they are reckoning on reaching that agreement as early as next year. The definition of artillery, incidentally, is quite a bulky document. It states, in particular, that cuts are to be made in all NATO and Warsaw Treaty artillery systems with a calibre of greater than 100mm capable of striking land targets mainly from covered-fire positions. This means cannons, howitzers, mortars, and rocket salvo fire systems, the list of which includes more than 40 artillery systems on each side. Interestingly enough, they managed to reach an agreement through a compromise, which was achieved by removing the brackets around anti-tank artillery systems. Just as the curtain was falling, if I can put it that way, the Warsaw Pact states put two new working documents on the negotiating table at once. I think these documents will give new impetus to the Vienna forum. They contain proposals such as a set of measures on information, monitoring, and stabilization. To put it briefly, the Warsaw Pact favors creating a simple, reliable, and economic system for monitoring conventional arms cuts. It is intended that along with the national technical means, the main instrument for monitoring adherence to the provisions of the future treaty will be on-site inspections.

[Agayants] Incidentally, many political observers have drawn attention to the fact that much of the document proposed by the Warsaw Pact is clearly in tune with similar proposals NATO put forward, in September, I remind you. An opportunity is therefore appearing to coordinate the sides' stances fairly rapidly and efficiently. As for the stabilization measures, this is a new avenue at the talks. It is an entire system designed to help avert the threat of sudden attack and increase the openness and predictability of the military situation in the European continent. Limitations are envisioned on the scale of maneuvers, on the conscription of reservists, and on the concentration of movement of troops and arms.

[Andrianov] I think we ought to say a few words about trust measures. The first accord in this area has also been achieved: To convene a seminar at a high military-political level to discuss and compare military doctrines.

In actual fact, the aim of the seminar is not in the least to prove to someone who has a worse or better doctrine. It is planned to direct the seminar along practical lines—i.e. it will concern the practice of military organizational development, the structure, numerical strength, and deployment of conventional armed forces. The aim of such a discussion is to raise the level of predictability of military activities in Europe to a qualitatively new degree, to reinforce the climate of trust. It will certainly have a positive effect on the work of the Vienna forum as a whole. That, perhaps, is a brief outline of the constructive results on which he third round of the talks on conventional armed forces and on measures of reinforcing trust and security ended in the Austrian capital.

[Vedenyapin] There is just one thing I would add: The stakes at these talks are truly great. After all, at the end of the day, almost 100,000 different units of modern weaponry will be scraped, including tanks, combat aircraft, helicopters, armored personnel carriers and artillery systems.

[Agayants] One more thing that should be noted is that the prohibition of chemical weapons is, as we know, one of the primary disarmament issues. The talks in this area have now really reached a crucial stage; it is now essential that everyone unite their efforts to resolve a few fundamental issues.

[Andrianov] I remind you that in his speech at the UN General Assembly at the end of September, President Bush called for the threat created by chemical arms to be stopped and reversed. According to him, the United States is willing to destroy all its chemical weapons in the course of 10 years on the condition that all countries capable of producing chemical weapons sign a treaty on their complete prohibition.

[Vedenyapin] At a recent briefing in the U.S. State Department the journalists asked the official spokeswoman, Margaret Tutwiler, to spell out the administration's position regarding the conditions on which the United States might opt to scrap its chemical weapons. Here's what she said: The first step will be the signing of a Soviet-U.S. agreement destroying existing chemical weapons stocks to the level of 20 percent of present stocks in the United States. Then, when the international convention comes into force, we will assume the obligation, quoting Margaret Tutwiler once again, assume the obilgation to destroy 98 percent of those weapons from the present level in the course of 8 years. We will destroy the remaining 2 per cent in the course of 2 years, after all countries with the potential to create chemical weapons join the convention. If all those states sign the convention in the course of 8 years, it would mean that the United States will destroy all its stocks in 10 years. So, that is the explanation.

[Agayants] By the way, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, the University of California scientist (Norman Cousins) believes that this is too long.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, and he's not alone in that.

[Agayants] No, of course not. But Cousins thinks the White House seems to be displaying far less interest in achieving an arms control agreement allowing a cut in the military budget than the USSR. The Americans are still having difficulty shaking off the old image of an aggressive Soviet Union, to which they are accustomed. As before, these stereotypes are being foisted on them by the gigantic U.S. military-industry complex that has swollen over the past 10 years and has the most powerful lobby in the U.S. Congress in the country's entire history. In order to win each other's trust, thinks Cousins, the United States and the USSR must cooperate more closely not only on disarmament issues, but also in the tackling of other global problems of significance for the whole of mankind. The author believes environmental protection to be one such important sphere of cooperation. This problem, he notes, must be tackled within the framework of the United Nations by creating an appropriate mechanism and formulating international laws common to all countries aimed at protecting the subsoil, water bodies, and the air of our planet. The United States and the Soviet Union could, of course, make a most substantial contribution to the fulfillment of that task.

[Andrianov] Still, let's get back to the subject of chemical weapons. One cannot but be disturbed here by the reports of a new approach by the U.S. Administration to the problem of prohibiting these weapons. One's attention was drawn to an article published in THE WASHINGTON POST on 9 October. Quoting a representative of the George Bush administration, it stated that the essence of the new approach is a review of the draft convention already drawn up on banning chemical weapons in the aim of allowing production of them after the convention comes into force. If this new approach reported by THE WASHINGTON POST is put into effect at the talks it will wreck the existing basis for agreeing a draft convention and push far back the negotiating process which has already reached its concluding stage. One cannot fail to see that such a proposal could become a factor encouraging the spread of chemical weapons before the convention comes into force and legalizing their proliferation even within the framework of the convention itself.

[Agayants] If what is said in the article you mention is in keeping with reality, it will unquestionably mean one thing only: The accords already achieved at the talks are being sacrificed to the program for the production of binary chemical ammunition.

[Vedenyapin] Unfortunately all the indications are confirming these fears. It is said that this week President Bush signed secret instructions allowing the Pentagon to continue producing the new generation of chemical weapons for an unspecified period of time. This was stated by a representative of the U.S. Administration who wished to remain anonymous. This stance, one that has not been officially announced and is, to be blunt, inexplicable, runs counter to previous statements by the U.S. president. It can, of course, only have an adverse effect on the security of other countries and on the possibility of achieving progress at the talks on prohibiting chemical weapons, in which around 40 countries are taking part. Those talks were planned to end in November.

[Andranov] And it's interesting that the London newpaper SUNDAY TIMES the other day published an article containing blatant conjecture about our side exploiting genetic engineering for military purposes. It's clear that this conjecture has no real basis to it whatsoever, as was stated quite unambiguously by Lieutenant General Petrov, the head of chemical troops of our country's Ministry of Defense. There's a certain pattern showing through here. Fabrications of this type normally appear when real steps are being achieved at the Geneva talks on banning chemical weapons. The aim of such dubious publications is, I am convinced, to cast a shadow over the sincerity of our intentions in chemical disarmament matters.

[Agayants] I would like to stress once more that the present position of the White House is a climbdown from the draft of the convention already agreed on in Geneva. It is in flagrant contradiction to what was recorded by a joint statement on the results of the meeting between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and James Baker. The Soviet Union firmly considers that the convention must provide for a complete and effectively monitorable cessation of any production of chemical weapons from the moment that it comes into force.

We are calling for restraint and, before the creation of the final accord, advocate the cessation of production of chemical weapons even before the conclusion of the convention. I will remind you that our country ceased such production back in February of the year before last.

[Andrianov] This week a Soviet-Japanese symposium took place in Tokyo. Well-known Japanese scholars and Sovietologists and a representative from the Soviet delegation took part in it. An extremely topical central theme for the discussion was determined—perestroyka and modern socialism. Although its particpants did not limit themselves to the framework of just this subject. They also thoroughly examined the influence of the reform process in our country on the relationship between the Soviet Union and Japan.

[Agayants] I think that the assessment on this reform process which the Japanese scholars who spoke at the symposium gave is of interest. Here is, for instance, the opinion of (Simutomayu), professor of the Hosei Daygaku University. He considers that, as far as its significance is concerned, the restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union can only be compared with the Great October Socialist Revolution. Although its initiators have to solve extremely difficult tasks in the economic and financial spheres, as well as in the sphere of social policy. Among the fundamental achievements of this many-sided process should be included the fact that Soviet society has become more open. Democratization and glasnost are developing in an unprecedented way. In his address Professor (Simutomayu) remarked that, according to his evaluations, perestroyka in the USSR has successfully passed its first trials of strength.

[Andrianov] But it must be admitted that (Sigeki Kakamala), a sovietologist from the Tokyo university of (Auyama Gaukin) has a different opinion on the restructuring processes in our country. In his speech was heard a thesis on the weakening of the influence of the CPSU as a leading force and on difficulties in the introduction of the market mechanism into the economy. This scholar put forward a theorized premise on the growth of dissatisfaction of the USSR population in the future, adducing numerous figures on a sharp increase of labor conflicts and strikes in various regions of the Soviet Union in corroboration. The conflict between radicals and conservatives in the Soviet parliament also did not go unremarked

[Vedenyapin] Well, there is no doubt that polarized opinions and assessments were expressed at the forum in Tokyo. That is, on the whole, natural. I think it would be strange if just unanimity reigned there. That is what a discussion is all about.

All the more important, in particular, are those statements where a positive assessment was made of our country's new course. Thus, one more prominent Japanese scholar and politologist, (Shindo) declared, for example, that the transformation process initiated in the Soviet Union on the initiative of the present leadership has already lead to positive progress both in the field of foreign and domestic policy. In his words, Japan's intelligentsia relates to the policy of New Thinking proclaimed by the present Soviet leadershp with great hope and optimism. The Japanese scholar noted that the fact that it was thanks to this policy that the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium and short range missiles became possible and that the situation in the world as a whole has improved is beyond dispute.

A professor of one more Tokyo university, (Kharuki Wada)+, expressed the conviction that there are no alternatives to perestroyka in our country and that it will grow in pace. He considers that, in the incipient new circumstance it is necessary to persistently search for ways of deepening bilateral relations to the good of the peoples of both countries, overcoming, of course, at the same time, the problems which exist in them, proceeding from the interests of both the Soviet Union and Japan. He thinks that just such a realistic and constructive approach would make it possible to find solutions acceptable to both sides.

[Andrianov] The New Thinking policy has lead to noticeable development of a useful dialogue between the USSR and the United States. However, unfortunately, the same cannot be said of Soviet-Japanese relations. They, as before, are in a stagnant state.

To no small degree its preservation is facilitated by an assessment on the part of Japan of Soviet policy in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region which is at odds with reality. Tokyo and in particular, the Japanese Defense Agency, as before, keep on about the supposed Soviet threat remaining in the Far East. At the same time little is said there about the cutting of our armed forces in this region and our peace initiatives which concern the security, development and multilateral coperation in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region.

[Agayants] In connection with this, Boris Vasilyevich, I would like to draw attention to an article published in the SANKEI SHIMBUN newspaper. Moreover, it was timed to exactly coincide with the moment when the symposium was held. So, in this article a flagrant attempt was made to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's foreign policy which, as is known, consistently advocates an all-embracing political settlement of regional conflicts on the basis of broad national reconciliation. In this article there is a passage on Cambodia. SANKEI SHIMBUN alleges that our country has sharply increased aid to the Cambodian government, hinting at the same time, of course, at the military nature of these deliveries. Incidentally, the deliveries are carried out on the basis of already extant agreements and are commonplace in nature.

Moreover, it is well-known that the Soviet Union is ready to discuss with anyone the issue of the cessation by all states of military deliveries to all the Cambodian sides. However here, as in the case with Afghanistan, this readiness is not shared by the other side. It is known that the antigovernment Khmer groupings just recently received substantial batches of U.S. weapons.

[Vedenyapin] Since the discussion has moved on to the Cambodian problem, then one of the elements of its settlement is precisely the issue of ending foreign military aid to the opposing sides. Those countries concerned with this endeavor at one time took upon themselves corresponding obligations. The Soviet Union openly expressed willingness to fulfill such an obligation if the others also act in exactly the same way.

However, the forces of the Khmer opposition continue to receive such aid as we have just heard, through various channels. This includes automatic rifles, and grenade launchers, even recoilless guns. When this became known, a U.S. State Department spokesman hastened to declare that these weapons with the stamp 'Made in the USA' are supposedly made in Singapore, which also provides aid to the Cambodian opposition.

[Andrianov] It has already put them into operation, since in the western regions of Cambodia armed skirmishes have noticeably increased after the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops. According to foreign press data the opposition units expect to seize the part of Cambodian territory along the Taiwanese border and use it as a bridgehead for further offensive actions during the forthcoming dry season.

[Agayants] Yes, certain circles, of course, very much want to prove the combat readiness of the opposition units and their political weight. At the same time, the same circles are trying to claim that the Cambodian state is supposedly doomed, since it is allegedly incapable of survival. While this trial of strength continues on the battlefield, the sides' efforts on the political and diplomatic fronts have increased. Confirmation of this can be seen in the exacerbation of the wrangling at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly. At this forum the ASEAN countries have put forward a draft resolution on a Cambodian settlement. This document is consistent with the spirit of the old thinking and does not correspond to the present situation around Cambodia.

So, as you see, the reasons that so far no solution in the spirit of national consensus to the problems in Cambodia has been reached should in no way be sought in the Soviet Union's policy.

[Andrianov] With this we finish off our roundtable meeting. Its participants, Nikolay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin, and also Boris Andrianov, who has been conducting the broadcast, thank you for your attention, esteemed comrade radio listeners. Goodbye. All the best to you.

## Petrovskiy Discusses UN General Assembly Debate

### 'Post-Confrontational' Session

*LD1710164189 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 17 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—"The general debate which has ended at the current U.N. General Assembly session was serious and reassuring. It has, in fact, ushered in a 'post-confrontational' era in the history of the world community", Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR and assistant head of the Soviet U.N. delegation, stated at a press conference here today.

"The debate," he continued, "was marked by a new political spirit. But this 'post-confrontational' climate did not rule out criticism. However, this time criticism was not aimed to discredit one side or another, one socio-political system, or another. It was a frank discussion of existing difficulties."

"On the whole," Petrovskiy continued, "the speeches of most delegates were keynoted by their desire to revive U.N. ideals and first and foremost to implement those ideals both in the activities of individual states and of the international community as a whole."

Petrovskiy said that relations between the USSR and the United States were in the spotlight. "Most states regard the attention paid to international topics by the Soviet-American dialogue as an expression of mutually-supplementing bilateral and multilateral efforts," he said.

"The Soviet Union is making a notable contribution to the U.N. renovation," Petrovskiy noted. He drew attention to the Soviet document "on the role of the United Nations in the interdependent world," submitted this Monday to the U.N. secretary general. It outlines concisely the Soviet concept of the role of this organisation and its specialised organs in the new world situation.

"The crux of this concept," the Soviet diplomat said, "is that the United Nations should be fully restored as an instrument of international security and broad cooperation. It calls for a consistent deideologisation of the United Nations and its specialised bodies, urges to overcome the artificial politization of their activities. The Soviet Union wants international organisations to concentrate on concrete tasks within their competence. The document also stresses the need for a responsible approach to decisions passed by international organisations.

"Compulsory resolutions must be observed without fail," Vladimir Petrovskiy pointed out. "As to recommendations, including those passed by consensus, it is necessary to check their implementation in the practical policy of states."

### 'Encouraging Tone' Seen

*PM1810154089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[A. Lyutyy report: "New Level of Communication"]

[Text] The general political discussion has ended at the 44th UN General Assembly Session in New York. Some 154 leaders of delegations spoke, including 23 heads of state and government. How did this year's discussion differ from previous occasions?

Answering this question, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy noted at a briefing held yesterday that the discussion was conducted in a serious, encouraging tone which basically marks the start of the post-confrontational period in the United Nations' activity. The common desire to engage in a joint quest for a solution to the persisting problems was sensed. In the course of the debates a new level of political dialogue that does not rule out criticism was displayed. But the criticism was not superficial and was not aimed at discrediting a particular country, sociopolitical system, or set of ideological values. It amounted to a frank discussion of the difficulties that exist.

Interesting ideas were put forward and concrete proposals made from the lofty platform of the United Nations. There was a broad positive response to the speech by the head of the Soviet delegation to the session, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. In general the dominant feelings were in favor of the revival of UN ideals.

What problems were the leitmotiv of the discussion? As the speaker at the briefing said, the subject of Soviet-U.S. relations was a major topic. The subject of the all-European process was well aired. Along with questions of disarmament and the settlement of regional conflicts, the attention of the world community focused on what could be described as nonmilitary security factors. Thus 130 of the speeches mentioned the need to protect the environment. There was also significant progress in the discussion of human rights—they were not as contentious as in previous years.

With the session's transition to the next crucial stage—the examination of specific items on the agenda in the appropriate committees, the deputy foreign minister said, the Soviet delegation sees it as its task to translate into resolutions the ideas and proposals formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's well-known addresses to the United Nations.

## Peace-Making Potential Being Realized

*LD2310122389 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The peace-making potential of the United Nations charter is so rich and diverse that the international community has begun to fulfil some of its major provisions only now, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy told TASS.

"Despite the fact that the U.N. Charter was created in 1944-1945, when mankind did not face nuclear arms, ozone holes or greenhouse effects, and had not lived through such accidents as Chernobyl, the document is flexible enough to enable the world community to respond to contemporary challenges," Petrovskiy noted.

Describing renewal in the United Nations, Petrovskiy stressed that it was the return to the basic provisions of the U.N. Charter that enabled the world community to pass "from confrontation polemics to constructive coordination of states' efforts to consolidate security in all spheres of international life."

It is not only the question of settling political and military conflicts and crises. Global problems, including environmental protection and measures to combat international terrorism and drug trafficking, are increasingly important as well.

Touching upon the recent election of Cuba and Romania as non-permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, Petrovskiy noted that "this very important body of the world community has been joined by two active advocates of renewal that will contribute to its activities."

## United Nations Discusses Central America Situation

*LD2410101289 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Text] New York October 24 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The U.N. General Assembly discussed on Monday the situation in Central America and adopted, without voting, a resolution drafted by five countries of that region.

The report by the U.N. secretary-general on the issue, noted that the situation in Central America had considerably improved in the past few months.

Political settlement of the major conflicts in the region can now be foreseen on the basis of the peace plan signed by the presidents of five Central American states.

The election campaign in Nicaragua, as well as the voluntary demobilization and repatriation of the Nicaraguan anti-government groups, make it possible to achieve national reconciliation on the basis of democratisation and an end to hostilities in that country, the U.N. secretary-general believes.

Perez de Cuellar expressed hope that the U.N. Security Council will set up very soon a U.N. monitoring group for Central America. This will make possible to carry out impartial verification of the implementation of the pledges by the five presidents including their obligation not to use their territories for attacks on other countries.

The resolution, approved by the U.N. General Assembly session, welcomes the agreements on settling the crisis in the region and calls on the governments of the region to continue efforts to establish a stable and durable peace in Central America.

The document expresses support for the efforts of the U.N. secretary-general to promote the peace process in the region.

The resolution also calls upon the countries situated outside this region but having relations and interests in it, to promote the process of fulfillment of the agreements reached by the presidents of five Central American countries and refrain from any actions hindering the process.

According to many experts in the U.N. headquarters, this phrase is addressed to the United States Administration and aims to convince Washington not to take steps that threaten to disrupt the process of peaceful settlement that has begun in the region.

This was stressed, in part, by the permanent representative of Nicaragua in the United Nations, Alejandro Serrano Caldera. He noted, among other things, that the United States must fulfill the agreements reached by the countries of the region in spite of the fact that the United States is not one of them.

Representatives of Peru, Japan, Yugoslavia, the United States, France, Libya and Cuba also spoke at the session on this matter. They supported the peace process in Central America.

On behalf of a group of Eastern European countries, the session was addressed by Lev Maksimov, permanent representative of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in the United Nations.

He stressed that there is a pressing need to impart an irreversible character to the process of politial settlement in Central America on the basis of respect for the freedom of choice and balance of interests, as well as on the basis of observance of the accords reached by the presidents of five Central American countries.

## Ryzhkov Greets Arctic Conference With Canada

*LD2310125189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Text] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has sent greetings to the participants of the international conference, "Strengthening Relations Between the USSR and Canada—Cooperation in the Arctic." The message says that such representative meetings play a significant role in the process of people realizing the integrity and interdependence of the modern world.

I am convinced, Comrade Ryzhkov noted, that your discussions will promote peaceful interaction between the USSR and Canada on many levels, the important sphere of which has become the Arctic.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov expressed confidence that the efforts of popular diplomacy aimed at strengthening goodneighborliness between our countries will have a favorable influence on the atmosphere of Soviet-Canadian relations, and on the results of the forthcoming Soviet-Canadian summit meeting.

## Council of Europe Delegation Visits Moscow

*LD2010212189 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 20 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—A second meeting of the joint working group for the development of contacts and intergovernmental cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Council of Europe was held in Moscow from October 19 to October 20.

The working group was formed on the basis of an arrangement reached during Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with members of the bureau of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg in July.

The delegation of the Secretariat of the Council of Europe was received by Anatoliy Adamishin, Soviet deputy foreign minister.

The sides discussed specific steps to implement the proposals advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev in his address to the session of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, and plans for the establishment of interaction between the USSR and the Council of Europe in the areas of culture, economy, education, information, law and other matters.

Joint recommendations were worked out and will be submitted for the consideration of appropriate agencies of the Soviet Union and the Council of Europe.

The Soviet delegation to the meeting was headed by Ambassador Yuriy Deryabin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Department for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The delegation of the Secretariat of the Council of Europe was headed by Chief of the Political Department Jean-Pierre Fourre.

## Conference on Third World Ends, Results Discussed

*LD2210220789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 22 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Mineyev writes:

Perestroyka in the USSR, the processes of renewal in other socialist countries, and the new political thinking taking root are making people take a new look at problems of development of countries of the "Third World," at the fates of the national liberation movement, at the class struggle, and at regional conflicts. This was the main conclusion arrived at by participants in the international meeting "Developing Countries in the Modern World," which ended in Moscow today.

Taking part in the forum, organized by the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa, were political and public figures of 58 countries and 4 international and regional organizations.

Soviet participants in the meeting made the assurance that the USSR would continue to give support to developing states on the road of social progress. At the same time many speakers called for the development of a new machinery of cooperation in solving problems of the "Third World."

The new political thinking could not remain just the destiny of the developed countries. One cannot limit the struggle for the survival of mankind only to USSR-U.S. relations. Regional conflicts are fraught with global danger: The great powers are, as a rule, involved in them, and some of the direct participants stand on the threshold of possessing nuclear weapons.

In the varied, multifaceted "Third World" today about half the countries have a low level of development. In a number of states leftist concepts of development have been defeated. The speeches by those taking part in the meeting proposed basic directions of stimulating development in conditions of the scientific-technical revolution. These were democratization of public life, political and economic pluralism, and cooperation equally among each other and with developed countries.

Speakers were of the unanimous opinion that young states play a huge role in the modern world and if they suffer failure it is mainly due to their lack of liason, the TASS correspondent was told by Mikhail Kapitsa, chairman of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa. The participants in the meeting, he noted, highly appraised perestroyka in the USSR, the progress which confrontation to cooperation in relations between the great powers, and the efforts to settle regional conflicts. At the same time it was said that the United States and a number of other Western powers are continuing their destabilizing interference in "hot spots." Therefore, still greater solidarity of the peoples is needed.

## 'Intermosbank' To Concentrate on Joint Enterprises

*LD2110102989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Oct 89*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A document has been signed in Moscow on the creation of the first joint commercial bank in our country with the involvement of foreign capital. Correspondent Kostenko reports:

[Kostenko] [video shows document signing] The International Moscow Bank [Intermosbank]: It will find its way into the register of the world's banks under such a name. Created with the involvement of major West European joint-stock banks, it will concentrate its main resources on financing joint enterprise in the Soviet Union. Intermosbank will also conduct operations in the international hard-currency market and finance joint projects abroad, thereby promoting world-wide integration of the Soviet economy in the world economy. Among its five foreign shareholders are world-renowned banks from France, Finland, FRG, Austria, and Italy. Their contribution comprises 60 percent of the aggregate 100-million founding capital sum [currency not specified] of the International Moscow Bank. [video: Clips from advertising video for the new Intermosbank]

[Begin recording] [Enrico Berlucci, president of Banca Commerciale Italiana, in Italian with Russian translation superimposed] Our bank has been working for quite a long time with Soviet partners—30 years—and, by participating as a shareholder in this project, we are sure that it will be a highly successful enterprise. Contemporary banking technology and access to world finances—we are providing that—guarantee the new bank a reliable prospect. [video shows Berlucci speaking to television correspondent and then with other officials]

[Kostenko] The Soviet side is represented in the Administrative Council of Intermosbank by three participants: the Industrial Construction Bank, the Savings bank, and the USSR Foreign Economic Bank.

[Yu. S. Moskovskiy, chairman of the board of the USSR Foreign Economic Bank] The creation of this bank will provide an additional impetus for the development of foreign economic contacts and for international cooperation. This bank may become an intermediary and adviser for the promotion of the Soviet participants in the international market, taking into consideration the contacts which our foreign partners possess. I think it will be a highly profitable, efficient, and competitive bank. [end recording]]

## USSR Rejoins World Psychiatric Association

*LD1810075189 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 18 Oct 89*

[Text] Athens October 18 TASS—The General Assembly of the World Psychiatric Association voted to readmit the USSR to the WPA here this night. The General Assembly's decision also provided for a possibility of sending a mission to the USSR to assess the situation in psychiatry.

The meeting was held at the 8th World Psychiatric Congress, now in session in Athens.

The All-Union Association of Psychiatrists withdrew from the WPA in 1983 in protest against actions to politicise its leadership and to raise obstacles to a professional dialogue. Early this year the WPA Executive Committee examined a Soviet request to re-enter the WPA and admitted it conditionally.

A. Karpov, chief psychiatric expert of the USSR Ministry of Public Health, told TASS that "the Soviet delegation agreed with the General Assembly's decision, since we believe that our country is open for all and we have nothing to hide. Changes in the USSR are irreversible and will continue."

## United States & Canada

### Primakov-Led Delegation Leaves for United States

*LD2510101589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Comrade Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, left Moscow today. It will make an official visit to the United States at the invitation of the U.S. Congress.

### IZVESTIYA Details Jackson Hole Accords

*PM2410133789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3*

[B. Tikhonov report: "Steps of Cooperation"]

[Text] Almost every meeting between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state is marked by the signing of agreements on specific aspects of bilateral cooperation. The talks between E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker in Wyoming were no exception. Two intergovernmental agreements were signed, one on reciprocal visits for inhabitants in the Bering Strait area and one on a regional commission in the Bering Strait area, as well as a joint statement by the USSR and the United States on a common interpretation of the norms of international law regulating peaceful passage through territorial waters. In addition, the ministers approved a joint document entitled "Mutually Acceptable Conditions Concerning Recognition of the Jurisdiction of the UN International Court of Justice." The reaching of these accords was a notable event in Soviet-U.S. dialogue and of independent political significance.

The question of facilitating mutual contacts between the indigenous inhabitants of Chukotka and Alaska did not arise only yesterday. The necessary political conditions for resolving it within the framework of direct links emerged after M.S. Gorbachev's talks in the United States in December 1987. In a joint statement on the results of the meeting, the two countries' top leaders advocated expanding contacts and cooperation on Arctic problems. This intention was reaffirmed and concretized during the summit meeting in Moscow in May-June 1988.

The agreement concluded in Wyoming on reciprocal visits between inhabitants of Soviet Chukotka and U.S Alaska is designed to preserve the culture, traditions, and customs of the small peoples of the polar region by encouraging extensive contacts between them. Among other things, this agreement simplifies the procedure for border crossings and the procedure for drawing up documents. Soviet and U.S. citizens living in border areas of Chukotka and Alaska will not need visas to visit relatives and friends on the other side of the Bering Strait. When the agreement enters into force they will be able to visit each other for 90 days, and this will only require an invitation and a passport insert issued by the local authorities.

The second agreement provides for the formation of a regional commission in the Bering Strait region with very extensive powers, composed of representatives of both countries' border organs and local authorities. Its prime task is to provide practical assistance in implementing reciprocal visits between the inhabitants of Chukotka and Alaska and to resolve in a timely fashion all the questions that arise in the course of border contacts between USSR and U.S. citizens. In addition, the commission is called upon to help to organize regular cooperation between the border authorities and local organs of Chukotsk Autonomous Okrug and the State of Alaska on all sorts of questions. In particular, cooperation on mutual medical and other assistance in case of an emergency situation, which is quite possible in these harsh lands.

Growing awareness of the necessity for a uniform understanding of the principles and norms of international law is reflected in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the common interpretation of the norms of international law regulating peaceful passage by ships through foreign territorial waters, signed at the ministers' meeting. The statement enshrines the common Soviet and U.S. interpretation of the provisions of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

We can recall how acute, unpleasant moments have frequently arisen in Soviet-U.S. relations because of differing interpretations of the norms of international law regulating peaceful passage. The accord drawn up in Wyoming regarding the common interpretation of the appropriate norms creates the necessary preconditions for precluding such situations in the future.

The joint document on the problems of the UN International Court of Justice approved by the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state formulates the two countries' common approach toward the jurisdiction of the main UN judicial organ. I would like to recall that the present system of operation of the International Court of Justice is still based on the fact that every state determines the sphere of recognition of the court's jurisdiction on its own as it sees fit. This practice no longer meets the imperatives of international life. Coupled with the concept of the priority of common human values, the idea of the primacy of international law is becoming increasingly authoritative.

The submission by the Soviet Union of a comprehensive program for increasing the role of the United Nations, as expounded in M.S. Gorbachev's article "Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World," for examination by the world community gave a powerful boost to these processes. The program pointed out that the mandatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice should be acknowledged by all states on mutually agreed terms. Speaking at the United Nations in December of last year, the Soviet leader particularly stressed the importance of ensuring that every state has an interest in self-limitation via international law.

Consultations with other permanent members of the Security Council were held to develop our initiative. The document approved at Jackson Hole was elaborated during the Soviet-U.S. consultations on this subject.

It defines the procedure for transferring for resolution by the International Court of Justice disputes which may arise in the interpretation and application of a whole series of international conventions. It was agreed that initially these will be conventions concerning the fight against international terrorism and drug addiction (it is envisaged that in the future the range of such conventions can be extended by mutual agreement between the sides).

The singling out of these particular problems was dictated by the two countries' growing concern about the threatening scale which terrorism and the narcotics business interwoven with it are acquiring today. Coordinated actions by the whole world community based on a clear, uniform interpretation of international law are needed in the struggle against this evil, which knows no ideological borders.

But there is another point. We are dealing with an exceptionally delicate matter which brooks no haste. After all, both sides are in essence renouncing their sovereignty in favor of international institutions, albeit only partially, on a very narrow range of issues. Therefore the Soviet-U.S. accord enshrines a provision whereby the mandatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice does not extend to disputes connected with ensuring national security and individual or collective self-defense.

As agreed, the document approved in Wyoming has been handed on behalf of the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state to the British, French, and PRC foreign ministers as a joint Soviet-U.S. draft. On the basis of the document it is proposed to formulate an accord between all the permanent members of the UN Security Council. It would be of an open nature and any state that is party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice could accede to it.

The Soviet-U.S. accords concluded in Wyoming are important steps in the lengthy and difficult process of the perestroyka of USSR-U.S. relations. It is such joint steps that mark the transition from constructive mutual understanding to constructive collaboration.

## Moscow Radio on Baker's San Francisco Speech

*LD2410123789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Andrey Ptashnikov]

[Text] I would like to devote a few minutes to analyzing the speech delivered in San Francisco by U.S. Secretary of State Baker. Particular attention has been given to this speech insofar as it dealt with the prospects for development of Soviet-U.S. relations, primarily in disarmament issues. Saying that today the United States has in the Soviet Union a reasonable partner, Baker declared that the White House is striving to move from a world, as he expressed it, in which there are armed camps confronting one another, to a world in which both sides share optimism. All the opportunities are there for this now, since Soviet-U.S. relations are more promising than they have been since the end of the second world war.

Moving straight on to the problem of arms control, Baker admitted that this process could serve as a powerful lever in the cause of constructing a stable and prolonged peace. However, it cannot take place in a political vacuum: Meaning that solution of disarmament issues is directly linked with settlement of the political disagreements which still exist. Proceeding from this, the U.S. secretary of state stressed that reduction of those types of weapons designed for inflicting a first-strike, or for sudden attack, is a priority in the U.S. Administration's policy on arms control. It is well-known, however, that the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] program being developed in the United States serves for precisely such a strike. According to the head of the U.S. foreign policy department, however, the main emphasis in this program is laid on ensuring the stability of the United States. The White House therefore intends, Baker said, to reserve the right to implement the SDI program, within the context of the ABM Treaty.

What is his explanation for this? According to him, the United States must see clearly the tasks confronting it, for the United States and the USSR have not yet crossed the threshold of eternal peace in which war is impossible. We cannot cast into oblivion the nuclear weapons which were previously invented, either, nor wholly exclude U.S.-Soviet rivalry, Baker commented.

So you see, comrades, despite certain positive advances in arms control issues which have emerged recently, the United States, as before, has no intention of repudiating the Star Wars program. Its position in other disarmament issues for the moment still remains unstable, clearly, although Baker ended his peroration with words full of optimism. Namely: The Soviet-U.S. rivalry does not at all mean that we must stand on the edge of a nuclear abyss.

## Soviet Relief Team Flies to San Francisco

*PM2510112189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Interview with Academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences L. Badalyan, president of the "Health for the World" Association under the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and USSR State Prize winner, by N. Gogol: "Compassion Has No Need of Requests"—date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The attention of many of our compatriots is riveted on events in California, where dozens of people have died as a result of a serious earthquake and thousands need urgent medical assistance. Yesterday a group of leading Soviet psychiatrists with experience of work in conditions of the earthquake in Armenia flew out to the United States. They are taking a large quantity of medicines with them. Academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences L. Badalyan, USSR State Prize winner and president of the "Health for the World" Association under the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, answers questions posed by our correspondent.

[Gogol] Levon Oganesovich, would you please explain the significance of psychiatric help in a natural disaster such as an earthquake?

[Badalyan] It would be more correct to speak of a system of neuropsychological support in conditions of severe mental shock simultaneously affecting a large number of people. What has Armenia taught us?

Alongside the numerous examples of the courage and fortitude of thousands of people who accepted their own grief and that of their people with dignity, in the first hours and days after the disaster we had many cases of reactive neuropsychological disorders and depression. People who lost their relatives, friends, and homes experienced severe bereavement syndrome. That meant that even at the very beginning of the rescue work, the assistance of neurologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists was needed alongside the surgeons and traumatologists.

The serious condition of the people did not mean that they were mentally ill—it was a normal psychological reaction to an abnormal situation. But we specialists had to restore the people in shock to their normal state as swiftly as possible. We tried out a whole series of Soviet and imported psychotropic and neurotropic drugs, and in many cases we decided that the Soviet ones were the most effective.

[Gogol] Our achievements in the sphere of preparing effective psychotropic drugs are generally recognized. But let us not forget the very high standard of American pharmacology either. Will our medicines be useful in California?

[Badalyan] I'm sure they will, although they were sent on impulse, so to speak; at any rate, we did not wait for appeals for assistance.

The logic here is this. The variety of types of people and the enormous range of disorders in large-scale disasters require a wide range of drugs which may not always be available in sufficient quantities in a specific country, even a country such as the United States. Apart from that, our drugs were tried in extremely grave conditions in the Armenian earthquake and proved effective, although we had a great choice of foreign, including American, drugs. Apart from that, the Soviet specialists who have gone to America will be useful both in recommending medicines and in choosing methods of treatment for the neuropsychological disorders which are inevitable in an environmental disaster.

Incidentally, the Americans pay great attention to the experience of disaster medicine in our country and in particular its psychiatric and neuropsychological aspects. The very scientists who left for America yesterday, alas now for tragic reasons, had been invited to the United States for a conference on disaster medicine literally a few days before the events in California. And another fatal coincidence: The conference was to be held in San Francisco, which was worst hit by the earthquake.

[Gogol] Of course, our medics can be of great assistance in overcoming a serious problem like seismophobia. As far as I know, it is an urgent problem in Armenia to this day.

[Badalyan] This problem, which unfortunately is very complicated, has a real basis. Science has proved that the saying "it never rains but it pours" is more topical with regard to earthquakes than it is to anything else. After the catastrophic earthquake of 7 December of last year which destroyed Spitak and Leninakan, several hundred more underground tremors were recorded, although they were admittedly much weaker. A person who has experienced a terrible tragedy is naturally afraid that it will happen again.

Seismophobia can be treated by a good doctor and time. I will not go into the scientific subtleties of the given question, but I am convinced that the Americans will also come up against this problem, and our experience, both positive and negative, gathered over a period of almost a year, will be useful to them.

[Gogol] I am convinced that the initiative of Soviet doctors, in particular the "Health for the World" Association under the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, which responded to the tragedy in California very promptly, will be warmly backed by many of our fellow citizens.

[Badalyan] Our American colleagues have come to our assistance several times recently. This happened in Armenia, when the "America Cares" trust created in the United States under the leadership of Robert McCauly made an important contribution to providing medical assistance to the victims of the earthquake. But no less important in those tragic days was the "sense of fellowship": This is as significant for the people and the country as for any person who has suffered a misfortune. Today it is our turn to show that we are ready to extend a helping hand at any time and that we are nearby.

## Northeast Asia

### Afanasyev's Remarks at Tokyo Symposium Refuted

*OW2110090889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 20 Oct 89*

[Text] PRAVDA, a newspaper in Moscow, carried an article by its Tokyo correspondent Latyshev. The article is related to remarks Mr Afanasyev, a historian and Congress of People's Deputies member, made in Japan. The following is a summary of the article:

Mr Afanasyev, who visited Japan 2 days ago to attend a symposium on the problems of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, drew the attention of the Japanese mass media because of some sensational remarks he made at the symposium. In his remarks, he contended that international relations, which have been based on the Yalta Treaty in postwar times, should be reviewed. According to Mr Afanasyev's view, the Soviet Government's unconstructive stance has hampered the development of Soviet-Japan relations. Mr Afanasyev clearly supported the return of four islands in the Kurils to Japan. In this respect, he made these remarks without obtaining any agreement from thousands of the islands' residents. A majority of these residents were born and raised there. They regard the islands as their homes for these reasons.

Mr Afanasyev is totally ignorant of the Kurils' history, that the islands were first developed by Russian explorers in the mid-18th Century, and that they were abused by the Japanese military for the [word indistinct] purpose during World War II. Moreover, Mr Afanasyev seems ignorant of the fact that Japan's demands for the return of the territories is no more than an excuse designed to keep Soviet-Japan relations cool. Many experts believe that Japan has no grounds for requesting the return of the territories. Many Japanese political organizations have asked for the return of all islands in the Kurils to Japan. Moreover, right-wing organizations in Japan have even called for the return of southern Sakhalin to Japan. Japanese newspaper headlines reflected that Mr Afanasyev is the first Soviet person who, despite his official position, publicly criticized Soviet foreign policy and recognized Japan's demands for the return of the territories. However, some Soviet symposium participants sought to make Japanese symposium participants understand that Mr Afanasyev's remarks did not reflect the view of the Soviet people. As evident in a recent Soviet poll, a majority of those polled were against Japan's demands for the return of the territories.

### Soviet-Japanese Ties Evaluated on Anniversary

*OW2110203889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 19 Oct 89*

[Political commentator Andreyev commentary]

[Text] On this occasion of the 33d anniversary of the restoration of Soviet-Japanese relations, we will now broadcast a commentary by Radio Moscow political commentator Andreyev:

The 33d anniversary of restoring diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Japan based on the joint statement signed in Moscow in 1956 falls on 19 October. We cannot say that Soviet-Japanese relations have been constantly developing in a favorable way. However, there have been signs recently of a favorable development in the promotion of bilateral relations. In fact, Soviet-Japanese relations have reached a high level in many fields. Although a peace treaty has not been signed between our two nations, Soviet-Japanese relations are based on a fairly extensive legal foundation that consists of more than 60 effective treaties, accords, and agreements in various fields signed between the two nations during the past 33 years.

With the intention of advancing Soviet-Japanese relations in all possible fields, the Soviet Union has constantly promoted its ties with Japan. Because the Japanese leadership has maintained that bilateral relations should be promoted, we can say that the two sides are very close on this issue. As former Prime Minister Uno said when he served as foreign minister, it was the intention of the two sides to bring each other closer together that has made it possible for the so-called buds of Soviet-Japanese relations to flower.

Our two nations have maintained bilateral relations by actively making such political contacts as exchanges of messages between the leaders of our two nations, exchanges of visits or talks between the foreign ministers of the two nations, and working-level consultations on various problems. After a temporary decrease in the amount of trade, Soviet-Japanese trade has once again increased; Japan ranked third among the Western advanced nations as the Soviet Union's trade partner in 1988. Scientific and technological cooperation between academicians and experts has gradually been expanding.

In international relations, perhaps it will be impressive for those who believe they are not so well-informed to know that since the governmental agreement on cultural exchanges went into effect in December 1987, it has given impetus to cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and Japan, and the exchanges have made further advances. In accordance with this agreement, a Russian-Soviet Art Festival has been successfully concluded in Japan, while Japan Week activities have ended successfully in the Soviet Union. Thanks to the efforts of the Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers, it has become possible for our two nations to make positives advances in many fields. The Soviet Union highly appraises the foreign ministerial talks that have contributed greatly to the development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

In addition, Soviet-Japanese contacts have become activated through other channels. For the first time in 5 years, a delegation of the Supreme Soviet will pay an official visit to Japan in November 1989. Likewise, an accord was reached on the visit to the Soviet Union by a Liberal Democratic Party delegation from Japan at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The Soviet Union not only welcomes such actions but also supports the overall expansion and continuation of such activities.

Furthermore, an accord has been reached on a dialogue between the top leaders of our two nations. At the Soviet-Japanese foreign ministerial talks held in New York recently, it was pointed out that it would be possible for General Secretary Gorbachev to visit Japan in 1991. His visit to Japan will be one of the most important events; an interim review of the development of Soviet-Japanese relations will be made through his visit. It will give a new start to the advance in bilateral relations. It is certain that preparations for the general secretary's visit to Japan will soon become a major theme at the negotiations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

Preparations probably will be made at the same time as negotiations on concluding a peace treaty to be held between the foreign ministers of our two nations. As is known to all, a permanent working group has been established to promote negotiations on the conclusion of a peace treaty, and the group's activities have already brought about favorable results. It is almost certain that the working group will continue its activities for some time to come because the problems with which it has to deal are very complicated and difficult to solve.

Based on what we have just mentioned, we expect, on this 33d anniversary of the restoration of Soviet-Japanese diplomatic relations, that political ties between our two nations will make a major positive advance in the near future. For this purpose, it will be necessary for the two sides to begin from objective reality and indicate flexibility in their approaches. We feel that only then will Soviet-Japanese relations be upgraded in various fields to a level conforming to the potential of our two nations and to our international positions.

## Near East & South Asia

### Israel's Novik on Preparations for Peres Visit

*LD2110141689 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 21 Oct 89*

[Text] As we have reported earlier, the Soviet Peace Committee has invited the Israeli deputy premier and finance minister, Shim'on Peres, to visit the Soviet Union. Recently, Mr Peres' aide, Dr Novik, visited Moscow. Radio Moscow's Boris Markovnikov asked Dr Novik about the purpose of his visit:

[Begin Novik recording] I was invited by the Soviet Peace Committee in order to prepare the possible visit of the vice premier and minister of finance, Mr Shim'on Peres. They were very successful. I had very important meetings, both with senior members of the Soviet Peace Committee, as well as representatives of the Soviet Government and the Soviet party, and some others from academic institutions. In all these meetings, I saw that my interlocutors shared my appreciation of the importance of this visit and we entered into some detail of the agenda of the proposed visit. [end recording]

Dr Novik says the his chief aim will be discussing economic questions. He said he mostly talked about economics in Moscow. The Israeli side had prepared a comprehensive program of mutually advantageous economic cooperation with the Soviet Union in agriculture, aircraft building, education, health care, energy, and tourism. They have also prepared a program of financing those projects with the participation of both countries' central banks. What did Dr Novik think of contacts between the Soviet Union and Israel in the context of a peace settlement in the Middle East? Dr Novik answered that he recalls three meetings of Shim'on Peres with Soviet officials, particularly with the foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze. Each of those meetings clarified both countries' positions on a wide range of problems. Shim'on Peres hopes his visit will also serve that purpose. It will include discussion of specific steps toward a peace settlement in the Middle East. The Israeli politician would like to explain in Moscow his position on the issue. He proceeds from respect for Palestinians' rights and a need to speed up a reconciliation between Israel and the Palestinian people and the Arab world at large. Dr Novik stressed that Mr Peres is for an active Soviet participation in a Middle East settlement. He is firm on that account.

### PLO's 'Abbas Interviewed on Peace Process

*LD2410125489 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—"Western news agencies reported a speech by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir who, while declining talks with the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), once again asserted that the PLO and peace are 'like fire and water'," a PLO Executive Committee member told TASS.

"The speech is yet another illustration that the present Israeli leaders cling to the old militant and absolutely non-constructive positions", said Mahmud 'Abbas, a PLO leader and co-chairman of the Soviet-Palestian committee on the Middle East.

He took part in the recently-ended international meeting here on the subject "the developing countries in the present day world". The meeting was organised by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

"The PLO's stand is utterly clear: We are in favour of putting an end once and for all to the decades-long conflict which has already brought on five fierce wars," 'Abbas emphasised.

"The PLO recognised U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, came forward with the idea of recognising Israel and favours talks with it.

"Israel has long been lacking even a semblance of a pretext to refuse a dialogue with the PLO which has been recognised by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab Palestinian people.

"Tel Aviv's so-called peace initiative is aimed at excluding the PLO from the negotiating process and thereby hindering a settlement. The essence of the Israeli 'initiative' is that Israel is ostensibly prepared to have talks with representatives that may be chosen on the West Bank and Gaza Strip but that it refuses to have a dialogue 'with the PLO, its members or PLO-appointed people'," 'Abbas told TASS.

"Of course, sober-minded Israeli politicians and many Israeli people are aware of the danger of frustrating a dialogue, and ever more firmly condemn the course," 'Abbas said.

"Meanwhile such a dialogue is under way and instances of interaction between the Palestinians and Israelis multiply. The activities of the Israeli-Palestinian Association of Physicians in Defence of Human Rights, set up more than a year ago, may serve as an example.

"But while physicians—both Palestinian and Israeli—can successfully cooperate, why should the very opportunity of a direct, frank Israeli-Palestinian dialogue in the political sphere be rejected?

"We are now witnessing increasingly active international support for our position and our peace initiatives, and not only in the Arab world," 'Abbas said.

"Moscow's offer of mediatory services—to organise a meeting of PLO and Israeli representatives on Soviet territory—has been praised both in and around the region.

"I would like to emphasise that the intifadah [uprising], which began in December 1987, highlighted the impossibility of maintaining the status quo and persisting in the occupation.

"Of course, the intifadah is not only an impressive demonstration of the Palestinians' indomitable will for independence. It also means sacrifices and suffering of thousands of people. Over the 22 months that have passed since the intifadah began, almost 950 Palestinians were killed, about 50,000 injured, and more than 64,000 imprisoned or subjected to the so-called administrative arrest.

"Counting on a business-like constructive dialogue, and not on force, is the realistic way towards working out a platform, acceptable to all parties, for a solution to the conflict," 'Abbas said.

"In a message of greetings to the participants in our international meeting, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that only a policy based on new thinking and upholding the principles of the balance of interests meets the peoples' interests.

"The permanent member-states of the U.N. Security Council can and must play an important part in determining such a balance.

"The idea of convening an international Middle East peace conference under U.N. auspices is also highly topical now. It is this kind of forum that may provide a real chance for a historic compromise between the Arabs and the Israelis."

### Al-Ta'if Accord on Lebanon Welcomed

*LD2410204689 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary entitled: "The Fate of Lebanon Is In The Hands of the Lebanese"]

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Today in Jeddah, with the attendance of King Fahd and the foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and Algeria, the official ceremonies concluding the meetings of the Lebanese deputies took place. During the ceremonies it was announced that the National Accord Charter was finally agreed after a few alterations and changes.

The Lebanese deputies conferred last night in Jeddah to analyze the reactions of the Arab countries and the international community to the establishment of reconciliation.

It is noteworthy that most of the reactions were very good. All the Arab countries, without exception, the PLO, and many other countries in the world, including the permanent members of the UN Security Council, welcomed the results of the Lebanese meetings in al-Ta'if, and expressed hopes that the National Accord Charter will be implemented in full. Public opinion on this matter could be summarized in the following words: The fate of Lebanon from now on is solely in the hands of the Lebanese themselves. No one else has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Lebanese. There is only one possibility for interference, when the matter requires a new mediation for the implementation of the agreements, provided that this mediation is carried out only by the tripartite Arab committee.

After their meeting yesterday in Jeddah, the Lebanese deputies announced that on returning to their country, they will inform people about all the points and details of the National Accord Charter, and that they will present their action program for the near future.

Personally, I am sure that the Lebanese people, exhausted by their painful agonies, will agree with an overwhelming majority on the National Accord documents. In fact, the movements we see now in Beirut and the other Lebanese regions are proof of this.

We hope that the Lebanese people will not resort to force, motivated by political or group selfishness, in order to frustrate the al-Ta'if agreements. According to Dr Salim al-Huss, if this happens it would be suicidal for Lebanon. Regrettably, we must say that today such a danger still exists, because the leaders of a number of Lebanese groups on both sides of the conflict have opposed the al-Ta'if agreements, or presented a number of grave reservations on the reformation of the sectarian system of running the Lebanese state. In addition to this, General Michael 'Awn addressed new threats to the deputies of eastern Beirut, and at the same time started to flex the muscles of his supporters. All these things have led to a slightly tense situation in Beirut. As a result of this, another mine, or explosive device, exploded in al-Hamra' in western Beirut. Heaven forbid that such an explosion leads to a chain reaction.

In addition, we can never forget that the Israeli occupiers of the southern regions could exploit any excuse to carry out huge provocative operations. It seems that it is not accidental that Tel Aviv and its agents have recently been increasing their aggressive activities outside the security belt region.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think that you will agree with me that under such circumstances there should be no place for extreme sentiments, selfishness, and ambitions.

## Afghan Rebel Plans To Stop Aid Convoys Criticized

*PM2410152089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Unattributed report: "Criminal Plans of the Enemies of the Afghan People"]

[Text] As we have already reported, the other day the "Salam Express" arrived at the Afghan port of Hayratan, bringing from Helsinki wheat, ambulances, equipment for outpatient clinics, and other items so badly needed today by the Afghan people, who are worn out by a prolonged war and suffer enormous privations and difficulties. These goods are Finland's contribution to the UN program for the economic development of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union has taken on the task of shipping it to the friendly country's border.

It is hard to overestimate the significance of the international community's efforts, including efforts under UN auspices, in the cause of selfless aid to the Afghan people.

But there are forces who have entirely different plans in mind. When the opportunity arises they are not averse to shedding a tear over the Afghan people's sufferings, but they have always acted and are continuing to act on the principle "the worse things are, the better." These forces do not think that the war has sufficiently scorched the land of Afghanistan and its people.

Recently the commanders of bandit formations operating in the region of the highway leading from northern Afghanistan to Kabul received instructions from Pakistani interdepartmental intelligence to destroy columns carrying UN freight, particularly from Finland. The task set is to cut off the flow of goods which enables the inhabitants of Kabul and a number of other important centers to cope with the privations and difficulties of the armed confrontation.

What antigovernment circles and their foreign patrons are unable to achieve through rocket shelling and sabotage or in open warfare, they now hope to take by starvation, the imposition of a blockade, and the disruption of humane actions, including those sponsored by the United Nations.

## Sudan Federation Proposal Assessed

*EA2310182089 Moscow International Service*
*in Amharic 1530 GMT 21 Oct 89*

[Text] The Sudanese People's Liberation Army reported on Tuesday [17 October] that it had surrounded Koloqi in southern Sudan. The Khartoum government has sent reinforcements to prevent the town from falling. The civil war in the Sudan has thus been aggravated.

In another development in Sudan last week, the committee established by the country's new military leaders to find a peaceful solution to the Sudanese problem completed its 6-week study on Thursday [19 October]. The committee proposed to federate the country, with the federation's components observing either Islam or Christianity.

According to the committee, a federation could resolve the problem of southern Sudan. It is known that the southerners do not want to be administered under shari'a law. It is hard to believe that the two mutually opposite sides could reconcile by federating. The leader of the southern rebels, John Garang, who refused to participate in the committee's proceedings from the start, has repeatedly said he stands for the country's unity and not its disintegration. He reaffirmed this position at a press conference during the week in Nairobi, after talks with President Daniel arap Moi. Meanwhile, Sudanese military leader General al-Bashir said that when the committee's document is presented to him, he will consider the issue of federation.

There is no way of telling if the idea of federation will be happily accepted by the Sudanese Muslim fundamentalists. They are very influential in the country. If nationalistic fervor erupts in the Sudan, it will not be hard to predict what kind of disaster will result. Such feelings would also further stir up secessionist tendencies in neighboring Ethiopia and Somalia. The problems of the Horn of Africa are interrelated in this sphere.

## Indian Troop Pullout From Sri Lanka Hailed

*BK2010095589 Moscow International Service*
*in Tamil 1400 GMT 19 Oct 89*

[Yegor Demichev commentary]

[Text] The PATRIOT and other newspapers have reported the beginning of the Indian troop withdrawal from Sri Lanka's northeastern District of Amparai. A brigade comprising 5,000 Indian soldiers is being withdrawn. Following that troops will be totally pulled out from Mannar area and there will be a simultaneous reduction in the number of Indian soldiers from the Jaffna peninsula. The beginning of the Indian troop withdrawal from Sri Lanka is major proof of Delhi's concern for the September accord under which all Indian troops will be withdrawn from Sri Lanka before 31 December this year.

We should remember that some battalions of Indian troops have already been withdrawn. Only after ensuring protection to the people in the Tamil-dominated areas are the Indian troops being withdrawn. In those areas, security will be ensured by Sri Lankan police and the civilian volunteer force units, which already have more than 2,500 members. According to many observers, these volunteer force units will discharge their duties in place of the Indian troops in the predominantly Tamil areas of Sri Lanka. They have already acquired good training and the number of volunteers is being increased. Local Tamil citizens enroll in the volunteer force, while there is also recruitment of volunteers for the Sri Lankan police force. According to Indian High Commissioner in Colombo L. Mehrotra, there will soon be an ethnic balance in the Sri Lankan police force.

Local papers say that the volunteer force and the Sri Lankan police force units, which are going to discharge their duties under Chief Minister Perumal in Northeastern Province, will be a significant feature and even after the withdrawal of the Indian troops there will not be any administrative problem in the Tamil areas of Sri Lanka. This reflects hopes for the restoration of peace and national integration in these areas.

However, we cannot say that the situation in the northeastern area has become totally normal, and favorable conditions in the Tamil dominated areas are being hampered in various ways. On some occasions there has been a problem with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam [LTTE], which has refused to lay down its arms. LTTE members have intensified their attacks on Indian contingents withdrawing from Amparai, hindering the process of withdrawal.

The situation in the Sinhalese-dominated Southern areas is also as tense as ever. The Sinhalese extremists, JVP [Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna], are active and are massacring at least 30 persons a day. It is evident that the situation created by the LTTE and the JVP extremists is an obstacle to solving existing problems. Great restraint and political wisdom are called for.

## Sub-Saharan Africa

### TASS Interviews SWAPO's Nujoma on Namibia

*LD2110144289 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 21 Oct 89*

["Sam Nujoma's Interview to Soviet Journalist"—TASS headline]

[Text] Windhoek October 21 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Osipov and NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY (APN) Correspondent Aleksandr Dobrovolskiy:

Our aim is a democratic state in Namibia in which every citizen will have guaranteed equal rights and opportunities regardless of the skin colour, Sam Nujoma, president of the South-west Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) said.

The heroic struggle of the SWAPO-led people is the decisive factor which led to successes in a peace settlement of the Namibian problem, he said in a TASS and APN interview. Fighting men of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, supported by the population, fought against the occupiers for 23 years. The international community's pressure on the apartheid regime is an essential element of our country's liberation.

The process of granting independence to Namibia has been delayed by South Africa's attempts to accede our country, Nujoma said. Pretoria could have done so, if we had not taken up arms. The numerous U.N. resolutions, including the Security Council Resolution 435, demanded that South Africa stop the illegal occupation of our land. Namibia's decolonisation received firm support from a number of U.N. member-states, among them the USSR, which always rendered us all-round fraternal assistance.

The SWAPO election campaign is in full swing, he stressed. We are seeking to bolster the political awareness of the masses, to rally them around their militant vanguard. We will win the November 7-11 elections to the constituent assembly. The people understand the SWAPO's role in the struggle against colonialism, apartheid and exploitation.

We advance toward independence with the programme of socio-economic transformation, with agriculture being our main concern. We intend to grant subsidies to farms, for instance which breed valuable Karakul sheep, originally from Russia. We have a specific plan to recover fisheries which have been almost fully ruined by colonial authorities. We want a 200-mile economic zone off our shores. We shall develop public education and open technical schools and a national university. There is also a programme to develop the public health system and broaden the network of medical institutions.

Land reform is an acute problem. We shall take stock of land resources to distribute them among the landless peasants, including white peasants. The untilled lands of the foreigners who left Namibia will become the property of the state. Landowners will get a compensation in case of nationalization.

Nujoma denounced a hostile anti-SWAPO campaign. The people shall not be misled by our enemies' propaganda manoeuvres, he said. Our people can tell friends from the enemies of real independence.

The SWAPO president noted the important role of the U.N. Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in the peace process.

SWAPO has proclaimed a policy of national reconciliation to bring all Namibians together to have peace and tranquility in the country. Nujoma said. This does not mean that we are going to fraternize with assassins who have their hands stained with the blood of our people. We realize that among them there are many people who were deceived and who could be reformed and brought to normal life.

## Situation at 'Crucial Moment' for Namibia Viewed

*PM2310141389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Vladimir Tyurkin "Observer's Opinion" under general heading "Namibia: A Green Light"]

[Text] News reports from Namibia cover a broad range. The flow of news from this country is swelling day by day. It is a certainty that none of the region's countries is likely to be more popular than Namibia in the next 2 weeks. This desert colony with a tiny population hardly exceeding 1 million is almost at a crucial moment, which will determine not only its own future but largely the future of the entire settlement in South West Africa. Elections to the Constituent Assembly will begin 7 November.

The South Africans are playing a dual role here. Taking advantage of the fact that, under the "UN plan," they will retain administrative control of the country until the very last moment, including the maintenance of order and the organization of elections throughout the territory jointly with the UN forces, they have—despite protests—retained antipartisan forces as guardians of law and order. Furthermore, they have ensured that thousands of whites now living in the Republic of South Africa [RSA], who have lived for not less than 4 years in Namibia at any time in the past, have been registered as voters. And can the armed attacks against South West Africa People's Organization aktiv members and supporters, the shooting at its headquarters, and the provocations be described as anything but connivance by the authorities?

On the other hand, following 3 days of sharp debate at the sitting in the RSA of the Joint Commission for Observance of the Settlement in South West Africa, the South Africans accepted a compromise. The settlement, now entering the final stage of its marathon run, was thus given a green light.

The finish will depend not least on the world community. For example, the UN efforts are actively supported by the African countries which, at this crucial moment, have demanded that the UN Security Council be convened to adopt additional measures for the successful holding of elections in Namibia.

## Army's Lizichev on Working Visit in Tanzania

### Departure 22 Oct

*PM2410132989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 First Edition p 3*

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, left Moscow for Dar es Salaam 22 October on a working visit at the invitation of the Tanzanian People's Defense Forces leadership.

He was seen off at the airport by Fleet Admiral A.I. Sorokin, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and other officials.

W. Mbago, Tanzanian ambassador to the USSR; and Brigadier O. Litango, air and naval attache at the Tanzanian Embassy in the USSR, were among the send-off party.

### Arrival in Dar-es-Salaam

*LD2410091389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1332 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Text] Dar-es-Salaam, 23 Oct (TASS)—Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, arrived for a working visit in Tanzania's capital at the invitation of Major General (A.S. Natepe), political commissar of the Tanzanian People's Defense Forces (TPDF). At the airport he was welcomed by J. Mak Weta, minister of state in Office of the President in charge of defense, Major General (A.S. Natepe), and other officials.

A.I. Fiyalkovskiy, Soviet ambassador in the United Republic of Tanzania, was among the welcoming party.

Today Army General A.D. Lizichev met with Colonel General E. Kiaro, chief of Tanzanian People's Defense Forces.

Then the Soviet visitor met with A. Kinana, Tanzania's deputy defense minister. During the conversation which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere, both sides stressed the importance of further developing Soviet-Tanzanian relations in the military sphere.

## East Europe

### Shevardnadze Arrives in Poland, Meets Leaders

#### Confers With Mazowiecki

*LD2410213289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1950 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] [No dateline as received] Today Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic [PPR] received Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Commettee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is here on a visit.

During a frank and substantive conversation the prospects for the development of Soviet-Polish relations in light of the changes taking place in the world and those reforms being implemented in the Soviet Union and in Poland were examined on a broad and fundamental plane.

T. Mazowiecki noted that for Poland relations with the USSR continue to remain a priority and said that the preservation of at least the current volume of economic links with the Soviet Union would have great significance for Poland's exit from the current economic crisis situation. E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet leadership was counting on the continuation of the traditional Soviet-Polish dialogue with the new PPR Government as well, and also intends to continue to give Poland help in resolving those tasks that stand before Polish society.

The head of the Polish Government gave a high appraisal to the policy of perestroyka conducted with great consistency and purposefulness in the Soviet Union under the leadership of M.S. Gorbachev. He stressed the huge significance of perestroyka not only for the Soviet Union but also for the whole world, including for the nature of Soviet-Polish relations.

The Soviet side conveyed the idea that perestroyka in the USSR and the economic problems that are being solved in Poland create not only requirements but also opportunities for seeking new, more effective forms of cooperation. The necessity for these is also becoming more urgent as a result of the two countries' courses for greater involvement in the world system of economic relations. Modernization of economic relations should also affect CEMA activity. The Polish side agreed with the issue being presented in this manner.

In discussing international political problems, the Polish side noted the enormous importance of the improvements in Soviet-U.S. relations that have taken place in recent years. E.A. Shevardnadze and T. Mazowiecki noted with satisfaction the beneficial processes taking place on the European continent. A suitable contribution has been made to these by the Warsaw pact member-states. This organization, according to both sides, can and should continue playing a useful and constructive role. The establishment of political contacts between the Warsaw pact and NATO is on the agenda.

Greetings and best wishes from M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, and the entire Soviet leadership were conveyed to the head of the Polish Government. T. Mazowiecki asked for cordial greetings and wishes of success in their activity to be conveyed to the Soviet leaders.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership the USSR foreign minister invited T. Mazowiecki to visit the Soviet Union on 23-25 November this year. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Talks took place between E.A. Shevardnadze and PPR Foreign Minister K. Skubiszewski.

Specific matters concerning the state and further development of bilateral economic ties were examined in a detailed and constructive manner. The intention of the sides to promote their development to the utmost, for mutual benefit, was stressed.

A number of aspects of the deepening of cooperation between the two countries in the cultural sphere and of the more profound acquaintance of their peoples with each other's life and traditions were touched upon.

In an examination of the issue of "blank spots" in the history of Soviet-Polish relations, the sides' interest in the complete restoration of the truth was confirmed. It was agreed that the foreign ministries of the USSR and the PPR will maintain constant contact on these matters at a high level, for regular reports to the ministers.

The Polish side provided an explanation of the fact that reports that have appeared in the press about claims that the PPR Government allegedly has against the Soviet Union in connection with reparations to Poland after World War II do not correspond to reality. This matter was settled in the past and problems of reparations do not arise in Soviet-Polish relations.

In a discussion of international problems, the ministers noted with satisfaction broad coincidence of the sides' views on the main problems of the present.

The talks proceeded in an atmospohere of frankness and mutual understanding.

#### Talks With Skubiszewski

*LD2410202489 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1830 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] We begin our news with the report on the visit to Poland of the USSR foreign affairs minister. [passage omitted]

Here is the office of the Foreign Affairs Ministry. During a private conversation which lasted nearly 2 hours Krzysztof Skubiszewski and Eduard Shevardnadze spoke above all about bilateral relations, including issues which result from our joint history. Next, also at the Foreign Ministry, plenary talks were held. They were dominated by economic issues. Krzysztof Skubiszewski stressed that relations with the Soviet Union, Poland's most important partner, must change in order to correspond to the sociopolitical processes taking place in the two countries. Krzysztof Skubiszewski confirmed that Poland is interested in increasing our trade exchange. Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the Polish side about the transformations, and at the same time the difficulties, in the Soviet economy. However, he confirmed that oil deliveries will be maintained at the same level. At the same time he presented an initiative for joint Polish-Soviet production for Third World markets. Polish indebtedness to the Soviet Union was also discussed.

A great attention was devoted to the Soviet Polonia [expatriate Poles in the USSR]. Krzysztof Skubiszewski thanked the Soviet side for making it easier to create an organization for the Polish ethnic group, and for respecting its needs, particularly regarding culture and religion. In this context the head of Polish diplomacy mentioned the matter of moral recompense for the Poles who were victims of the Stalinist repressions in the Soviet Union and the issue of a change of citizenship by persons intending to return to Poland. At the moment, over a period of 6 months, the applications of over 500 people received a positive response. In spite of difficult problems the talks took place in a very good atmosphere. Eduard Shevardnadze said that what is happening in Poland is not causing an allergy beyond the Bug [border river]—the Soviet Union can avail itself of the Polish experience after all.

Here is the building of the Council of Ministers and a meeting with Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki. The private conversation lasted nearly an hour longer than planned:

[Begin recording] [Shevardnadze speaking in Russian with superimposed Polish translation] I am deeply impressed. As you know I have held two rounds of talks with Foreign Affairs Minister Skubiszewski. I have just concluded a talk, a very important talk, with chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish pr people's republic Mr Mazowiecki. This was a very important and profound talk, about Polish-Soviet relations at their present stage, at a highly responsible stage in our relations. We discussed in great detail and in depth the issues concerning bilateral relations; we discussed the situation in Europe and in the world; the issues of disarmament agreements; the prospects of overcoming of military confrontation. I conveyed to Mr Premier an invitation on behalf of the Soviet Government to visit the Soviet Union. As I understand it, we have agreed that such a visit will take place in the last 10 days of November. Mr Chairman will perhaps specify the date more precisely, but what is most important is that this visit will take place, and I have no doubt that this visit will have great importance in strengthening the traditional cooperation and friendship between our countries, and increasing the effectiveness of our cooperation in all spheres. I am very pleased with this talk.

[Mazowiecki] I would just like to confirm what the minister said—that I am also very pleased with our multifaceted, and as you saw yourselves, very long conversation. I have received with gratitude the invitation to go to Moscow. I attach great importance to this visit. As I have already said, Polish-Soviet relations are for us an extremely important issue and the government which I lead attaches great importance to them. I think that the visit of Mr Minister to Poland allowed us to discuss many matters, which has strengthened our relations, and we said to each other: See you in Moscow. We shall continue this, most probably on 23 November. [laughter] [end recording]

### Received by Rakowski

*LD2510100889 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Warsaw October 25 TASS—Mieczyslaw Rakowski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, met today Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze who is on a working visit in Poland.

The friendly meeting was attended by Vladimir Brovikov, Soviet ambassador to Poland.

### Received by Jaruzelski

*LD2510135289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1328 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Warsaw, 25 Oct (TASS)—Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Polish People's Republic, received Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Foreign Minister, in Poland on a working visit, in the Belvedere palace today.

## Moscow TV Reports on Mass Demonstrations in GDR

*LD2410222689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2006 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] In a number of GDR cities, mass demonstrations have been held by working people. A total of about 200,000 people took part in them. Press reports note that participants in the demonstrations behaved in a disciplined way and caused no disturbances. [video showing crowds chanting and holding up slogans]. Those gathered near the GDR State Council building in Berlin, for example, read out a petition addressed to the deputies of the People's Chamber. It contained among other things proposals regarding elections of the chairman of the council of State.

Over 100,000 residents of Leipzig , the second largest town of the republic, spoke in favour of a change and a critical appraisal of the public and political situation in that country. The local authorities undertook measures to ensure order in the city during the demonstration.

In Schwerin more than 40,000 city residents got together for a rally. Without passing anything in silence, the participants held a constructive exchange of views on all urgent issues which are worrying the public of the Republic. Among speakers there were workers, representatives of the intelligentsia and Socialist Unity Party of Germany members. With the slogans Yes to democracy! More socialism! Less orders! Rallies have also been held in the cities of Halle, Dresden and Magdeburg.

### Supreme Soviet Presidium Congratulates Krenz

*PM2510100789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1*

[Message from USSR SUpreme Soviet Presidium "To Comrade Egon Krenz, president of the GDR State Council"]

[Text] Dear Comrade Krenz!

We cordially congratulate you on your election as president of the GDR State Council.

We express the hope of the further fruitful development of relations of fraternal friendship, close cooperation, and allied solidarity between the USSR and the GDR.

We wish you great successes in your activity for the benefit of the GDR people and in the interests of consolidating socialism on German soil.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

### Krenz Election as Head of State Council Reported

*LD2410193689 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Berlin 24/10/ TASS—The GDR News Agency ADN Reports:

Only ten minutes after the start of the debate, the GDR People's Chamber elected Egon Krenz, 52, chairman of the GDR State Council by a vast majority here on Tuesday. The collective head of state has 29 members, and its chairman represents the GDR in international law. The Council is responsible to the People's Chamber for its activities.

Egon Krenz, whom the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) elected its general secretary almost a week ago, was elected into the highest state office with 26 votes against and 26 abstentions. The other nine groups of the People's Chamber did not nominate candidates for the open ballot.

Krenz was also elected chairman of the National Defence Council with eight votes against and 17 abstentions.

Both offices had previously been held by Erich Honecker. The 77-year-old did not take part in the parliamentary session for health reasons. The session was requested by the SED group.

In the inaugural speech, which Krenz made after his swearing in on public weal and the Constitution, he said it was an urgent duty "to respond with competence, consistency and courage for the truth to the demands of the time." There was a need now to renew society on a solid socialist basis.

Dialogue would be a necessary and permanent part of political culture, Krenz said. "The variety of opinions paves the way for substantial and open dialogue."

Krenz called on all sides to avoid an aggravation of the situation or confrontation. Socialism was in a major process of learning which should be joined also by those who believed that "the road towards truth could only be found or even embarked upon with emotions."

Krenz regretted encroachments during some demonstrations in the past. He promised that charges in connection with police action would be thoroughly investigated and proven culpable action punished. The leadership was determined to settle political problems with political means, he said.

Krenz said experience made in the Soviet Union and other socialist states should be examined more carefully. He announced he would have an unprejudiced exchange of experience with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Krenz encouraged parliament, whose members did not vote unanimously for the first time in many years today, to conduct a debate marked by criticism and self-criticism.

The next thing to tackle was a draft law on travel which respected the legal equality of all citizens. He appealed to those wishing to leave the GDR, not to take this step, saying "our country is witnessing a new awakening. We want every one to join us in making a new beginning."

No one should draw wrong concusions from the GDR's development, Krenz warned and stressed the country's sovereignty. The same went for the relations between the two German states which were capable of being extended. "The peoples in the world, the states in the European continent may continue to fully rely on the GDR's preparedness for constructive cooperation for the benefit of security and stability in international relations," Krenz added.

### Further on Krenz Election Speech

*PM2510132389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Sitting of the GDR People's Chamber"]

[Text] Berlin, 24 Oct—A sitting of the GDR People's Chamber was held here today. Opening the sitting, People's Chamber President H. Sindermann noted that the Presidium of the country's supreme organ of people's representation intends to thoroughly examine all proposals by factions and commissions and, on this basis, to elaborate topics for a debate on problems as part of the further shaping of a rule-of-law state. There will also be a detailed and open discussion of pressing questions associated with national economic plans.

H. Sindermann went on to read out a proposal by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] faction to recall Deputy E. Honecker from the posts of chairman of the Council of State and chairman of the GDR National Defense Council. E. Krenz, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, was nominated as candidate for election to these posts.

As a result of the subsequent vote, deputies elected E. Krenz chairman of the GDR Council of State and chairman of the GDR National Defense Council by an overwhelming majority.

Addressing the People's Chamber deputies, E. Krenz specifically declared that the people's mandate imposes on them, more persistently than ever before, the duty to respond to the demands of the time knowledgeably, consistently, and facing up to the truth, to constantly find the best possible answers to the difficult questions awaiting solution in the GDR. Society's renewal, he said, needs the firm socialist foundation which has been laid through joint efforts. This renewal needs the solidarity and consciousness which are rooted in historical development and do not ignore the mistakes and one-sided deformations which also accompanied the building of the new society in past decades.

E. Krenz went on to declare that nationwide dialogue is and will remain a necessary and permanent element of political culture.

The experience of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist states, he went on to say, should be more thoroughly studied, and everything useful should be creatively applied in the GDR's national conditions. The forthcoming meeting with M.S. Gorbachev will give renewed impetus to the fraternal alliance between the two states and will promote an unprejudiced exchange of opinions.

Speaking about the activity of the GDR People's Chamber, E. Krenz declared that it ought to resume its parliamentary practice and examine draft laws in two, and if necessary several readings. Having advocated guaranteed openness [glasnost] for the expression of parliamentary will in the GDR, he submitted a proposal to organize extensive and skilled coverage of parliament's work by the mass media.

The speaker confirmed the GDR's commitment to all principles of the CSCE process, including the inviolability of existing borders. Touching on GDR-FRG relations, E. Krenz declared that the GDR advocates the further expansion of these relations on the basis of the treaty on the foundations of relations, and that it is ready to raise bilateral cooperation in various spheres to a higher level. Nobody should draw any false conclusions from political developments in the country. The GDR is a sovereign socialist state, and everything happening in it is subject to our country's sovereign decisions. NATO concepts and "advice" offered through the medium of reforms will not succeed in the future either, E. Krenz emphasized. [sentence as published]

## IZVESTIYA Reports on GDR Public Debates

*PM2410121389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1*

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Lapskiy: "GDR: Situation in Country Is Being Discussed"]

[Text] Berlin—The entire republic is engaged in a stormy discussion of the situation in the country since the Ninth Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Plenum. On Saturday afternoon a spontaneous demonstration took place in central Berlin. Over 1,000 people, mainly young, took part in it. The demonstrators were protesting against the police and security forces exceeding their powers 7 and 8 October in breaking up an unauthorized demonstration.

Guenter Schabowski, first secretary of the Berlin Bezirk SED Committee, the city's mayor, Erhard Krack, and many other leaders came to the city center.

Surrounded by hundreds of people, G. Schabowski said that he would like to avoid an "escalation of events" as a result of which people might suffer. The use of force cannot create a suitable climate for dialogue. Political conflicts must be resolved by political means. Since the Ninth SED Central Committee Plenum, he said, a change has been taking place in the country's social life. An opportunity has emerged for broad public dialogue on the most important questions. Inasmuch as an open and serious discussion has begun and that the questions addressed to politicians are being given specific businesslike answers, a climate has emerged in which there should be no place for incitement or demagogy.

The topics, which have been discussed directly in the open, in addition to events of 2 weeks ago, included the possibility of trips to Western countries, the right to demonstrate, and forms of conducting public dialogue.

Answering a question about the right to demonstrate, Guenter Schabowski stressed that the most important condition should be the guarantee of their peaceful outcome. The person who applies should bear full responsibility and the person who issues authorization must be concerned to ensure that there are no excesses during demonstrations.

It was stated that in the very near future GDR citizens' trips abroad will be regulated in a new manner. The government has already received this mission. Here we must, of course, consider that this problem is directly linked with the expenditure of hard currency. It has to be "transferred" from other items of state expenditure. Bonn's arrogation of the right to be "a refuge for all Germans" continues to be an obstacle.

No incidents of any kind occurred during the demonstration and the debates in the street.

Heated debates flared up recently among the students. Some 6,000 students from the capital's Humboldt University held a meeting and were unanimous that much must be changed and improved. There were disputes about what to change and how and some people expressed their distrust in the union of Free German Youth and even called for its dissolution. Others demanded that the Free German Youth radically alter its methods of work among young people and elect to leading organs those people who enjoy trust.

I would like to end this report with a quotation from an editorial article in BERLINER ZEITUNG published under the heading "Democracy Should Always Be Specific." The newspaper writes: "The doors have finally been opened to dialogue on forms of further social life in the GDR. Anyone who cannot see it is blind or deaf or does not want to know anything about the passionate debate launched throughout the country. No word is being repeated as often as the word 'democracy'... The specific form of our democracy must promote the improvement of socialism, not its dismantling."

The newspapers report the telephone conversation between Egon Krenz and M.S. Gorbachev. During the talk E. Krenz stressed that the experience of Soviet Communists in perestroyka is important to the GDR. M.S. Gorbachev invited the new SED Central Committee general secretary to visit the Soviet Union. The visit should take place very soon.

## Lack of Single Supplier Affects GDR Cooperation

*PM2310152589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Why Not Everything Is Going Well... Improving the Mechanism of Cooperation"]

[Text] Berlin—It is about 25 km from the city of Stendal to the new nuclear power station which is being built on the banks of the Elbe. But I did not spend much time asking people the way—soon there was a panoramic view of the construction site: 150-meter-high cooling towers, concrete structures stretching along the horizon, and a veritable palisade of cranes are visible from a long way off.

Distances here are measured in kilometers; I had to use a minibus.

Construction chief Guenter Mattsinke [surname as transliterated] says that the construction of the nuclear power station graphically embodies the close cooperation between the GDR and the USSR. The "Stendal" nuclear power station is being constructed on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement. The Soviet Union is developing the design and is supplying the VVER-1000 [water-cooled, water-moderated] reactors, turbines, and million-kilowatt generators. The GDR and other CEMA countries are manufacturing some types of equipment. Substantial additional safety measures which accord with the strictest international requirements have been provided for.

Right now there are 9,500 men on the construction site. The future nuclear power station needs reliable backup facilities—housing, a cultural center, a bakery, and consumer service enterprises for it are being erected in the city of Stendal. A railroad spur line to the construction site has been laid.

Before my visit I talked in Berlin with Eckhard Netzmann, first deputy general director of the "KAB" combine, which is involved in constructing the power station.

He said:

In order to ensure that the national economy develops normally the GDR needs to increase electricity production by no less than 2 percent per annum. Only then will we continue to secure an annual increase in national income of about 4 percent and be able to successfully solve economic and social tasks as a package.

The only form of fuel with which nature has endowed the GDR is brown coal. Approximately 320 million tonnes of it are extracted per annum. A number of thermal power stations constructed with Soviet cooperation are powered by it—Tierbach, Bocksberg, Hagenwerder, Enschwalde. But brown coal reserves are not infinite, and its quality is declining. And as far as the ecology is concerned it is not blameless—it has on its conscience the notorious acid rains. The GDR has no other sources of energy. Only one resource remains open—the atom.

Cooperation with the USSR in this sphere is vitally important for the GDR. It has already borne good fruit. Four power units which are basically equipped by Soviet plants are successfully generating electricity at the Bruno Leuschner nuclear power station in Greiswald. A fifth one is being made ready for commissioning. Three more power units are also being constructed. Useful experience has been accumulated.

The construction of nuclear power stations is only one page in the chronicle of extensive economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the GDR. The foundation of this cooperation was laid in the early postwar years. Since that time the number of facilities which are the fruits of our cooperation has multiplied, cooperation has risen to new levels, and it has acquired a new quality. The USSR and the GDR have at their disposal a comprehensive program of economic and scientific and technical cooperation through the year 2000. Also being formulated is a special program of cooperation between our countries in the development of the GDR's nuclear power engineering through year 2005. Specialization and production sharing are being developed in various sectors of the national economy. They are based on about 200 intergovernmental and interdepartmental agreements. Direct ties are being organized between enterprises. The first joint venture—"Tsentron"—has appeared, which will produce computer programs. There is no denying that each side is the other's number one foreign trade partner.

But I think it is worth pointing out the problems as well as the successes.

In conversations about the "Stendal" nuclear power station a note of concern could be detected in friends' voices. A big construction project is a complex organism. It is not surprising that each side participating in it sometimes makes mistakes—where don't they happen. But this time my friends' concern was caused not by routine failures.

They drew attention to the fact that the main contract for the delivery of equipment from the USSR, which would determine precisely and in mandatory form not only all types of equipment but also the delivery schedules, had not yet been signed. My friends believe this is one of the reasons why construction is behind schedule.

Of course, construction work is not coming to a halt. It is based on current annual contracts.

"This year," Guenter Mattsinke said, "the regular equipment delivery contract was signed only in May. And even then a number of provisions concerning deadlines have still not been agreed."

What is going on? I put this question to I.Ya. Baranov, deputy Soviet trade representative to the GDR, who is involved particularly with the "Stendal" nuclear power station.

"The trouble is," he answered, "that when earlier we gave the GDR help in constructing power stations we operated in a tightfisted manner—whereas now we operate with an open hand."

Talks with trade mission officials helped me understand the meaning of the image to which the deputy trade representative resorted. Previously Soviet technical assistance in erecting facilities in other countries was implemented via the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. The "Atomenergoeksport" All-Union Export and Import Association operated as part of it. When the number of state committees and ministries was being cut the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations was abolished, and "Atomenergoeksport," as an all-union foreign economic association, became part of the new Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations. The general supplier of nuclear equipment abroad was the All-Union Association "Soyuzglavzagranatomenergo," which is part of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification. It, too, wasn't bypassed by the reorganization. Under the name "Zarubezhatomenergostroy" it switched to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Atomic Power, and subsequently of the Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering and Industry. It is easy to understand that in the complex period, when changing "bosses," neither association could channel its work along the usual lines. Not only did their management change but also their place in the general economic mechanism.

But this is not the only point. There have been other complications. Not just the leading production associations and enterprises but also thousands of the most diverse plants take part in deliveries for a large-scale construction project like a nuclear power station. Under the previous system, which took shape within the framework of the administrative-edict system, the contract orders of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations were mandatory for the ministries. No one asked the enterprises whether they intended to fulfill them. But at the same time they were supplied with the necessary resources. Now the situation is different. Some "heavyweights" in the sphere of Soviet nuclear power equipment have tried to link up directly with the GDR customer or even "to haggle" after increasing prices excessively.

But the GDR prefers to deal with one Soviet organization—"Atomenergoeksport"—which could provide the entire package of deliveries and services during the construction of the nuclear power station. It's partner here is the "Industrianlagenimport" Association under the GDR Ministry of Foreign Trade. Soviet enterprise overtures directly to the nuclear power station under construction are misguided, they only waste time... As for prices, they have always been set with regard for world prices for the same types of equipmen[illegible]

We have given up the old mechanism of equipping foreign construction projects in the quest for a different, more flexible and efficient one. How then can we now tie up in a single, reliable package the whole range of deliveries for foreign nuclear power stations under construction? Who should do this? The search for efficient forms of cooperation needs to be quicker.

Our German comrades are increasingly insistently voicing the following idea: In constructing complete projects in the GDR the Soviet partners should act as one organization. It must b[illegible]e to fulfill all obligations under the existing agreements, that is, ensure not only the construction of the facilities but also their operation and, where necessary, their reconstruction or modernization. But now, my friends say, they simply do not have such a partner. There is no one to tie up the deliveries into a single reliable package.

Economists have long been drawing attention to the fact that the proportion of machines and equipment in deliveries from the USSR to the GDR is relatively small. It amounts to about 16 percent, I was told at the trade mission. And of course we want it to increase. Especially now when, because of the drop in oil prices, the balance of trade with the GDR is beginning to move against us.

I.Ya. Baranov acquainted me with these figures. From 1980 through 1985 the GDR received from the USSR machines and equipment for constructing complete industrial and other facilities to the value of R740 million. In 1986-1990 the volume of such deliveries is to reach R1.0-1.1 billion. Prospects are quite good for the next 5-Year Plan also. But there is a keen sense that it is necessary to organize cooperation efficiently. The stronger the curve on the graph of machinery and equipment deliveries from the USSR—including complete sets—the more reliable will be the guarantee of reciprocal deliveries from the GDR, including the consumer goods for which our internal market has such great need.

Of course, the basic contract for deliveries for the "Stendal" nuclear power station, which concerns my friends, will be signed. But the main problem now is to create in the new management conditions a mechanism which ensures the timely and high-quality fulfillment of commitments assumed under agreements on the construction of complete enterprises and other facilities, including nuclear power stations.

Whoever wants to win the reputation of a reliable partner on the world market must begin by consolidating that reputation where it is already represented—in the CEMA countries.

## Hungarian Republic Proclaimed; Marches Continue

*PM2410113289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov report under general heading: "The Changes Continue"]

[Text] Budapest, 23 Oct—The state flag was raised on Kosuta Square, in front of the parliament building, at noon. M. Szuros, chairman of the National Assembly, proclaimed the formation of the Hungarian Republic.

Various marches went on from yesterday evening throughout the day today. Parliament declared 23 October, which was marked in Hungary's recent history by the start of the tragic fratricidal events of 1956, to be a day of national reconciliation.

"All Hungarians must take note of the results of these events," M. Nemeth, chairman of the Hungarian Republic Council of Ministers, said on television. "The forces of Hungarian renewal cannot be on opposite sides of the barricades."

Streams of people are converging on Kosuta Square. At 1800 hours speeches by representatives of various parties and groups began to be delivered from the steps of the parliament building.

## Proclamation of Republic Viewed

*PM2410155789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 p 3*

[Own correspondent A. Kaverznev dispatch under the rubric "Budapest on the Line": "Four Days"]

[Text] Budapest—Extremely important events in Hungary's political life have spanned just 4 days, from Friday to Monday. They have reflected all the contradictoriness of the situation in the country, which is experiencing a new stage in its history.

A 4-day session of the Hungarian parliament has ended. As well as ratifying a number of most important laws concerning Hungary's state structure, as we have already reported, the deputies adopted a decision on a seemingly less significant question which prompted harsh arguments between the MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party] and opposition groupings. I refer to the Workers' Guard.

The first detachments of militiamen dressed in gray coveralls and armed with Shpagin submachineguns appeared on the streets in March 1957, a few months after the events of fall 1956. By that time the fighting was long since over, but the creation of armed detachments of the working class whose backbone was made up of party veterans and internationalist fighters was, so it was said at the time, a demonstration of their loyalty to socialism and a warning to the enemy. The militia subunits were entrusted with tasks of maintaining public order and guarding national economic facilities. The militiamen could take part in guarding the state border or eliminating the consequences of natural disasters. But in effect, although this was not publicized, the Workers' Guard was the armed force of the MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party] and was not subordinate to the government.

Clearly, this status of the Workers' Guard could not suit the opposition, which has strengthened in recent months. In May of this year the MSZMP Central Committee rescinded its former resolutions on leadership of the Workers' Guard and placed it under the command of the Council of Ministers. But the opposition continued to demand the disbandment of this armed formation. Now the State Assembly session has adopted a law on the disbandment of the Workers' Guard. No organizations will be created in its place. The Finance Ministry has imposed an embargo on its property, estimated at 11 billion forints. The fate of the property will be determined later.

Intense work to create the primary organizations of the MSZP, proclaimed 2 weeks ago, continues. Reports are coming in from the local level that county and city MSZP organizational bureaus are opening. I would remind you that the party congress laid down that local meetings must be convened before 31 October and primary organizations of the Socialist Party must be created before 10 November. All MSZMP members who agree with the Socialist Party's statutes and the basic provisions of its program statement will be able to certify this with their signature before 31 October and thereby join the new party. Unlike before, there is no need for any recommendations. However, judging by newspaper information, the ranks of the Socialist Party are not growing as rapidly as anticipated. Not everyone is hastening to join the MSZP, many people are biding their time. This is probably the explanation of the MSZP

Presidium's decision to extend the period of re-registration until 31 December. Hungarian and foreign journalists were informed of this Friday at a press conference by MSZP Presidium Members Ferenc Kosa and Csaba Vass.

Correspondents asked them the following question, among others: How come, despite the party congress' decision that party organizations must be able to be formed at workplaces, the State Assembly deputies, in discussing the law on the party, voted against this provision? Only a few of them supported their party's official position while the rest played into the hands of the opposition. Their decision will greatly weaken the party. It will have to form all its organizations on a residential basis alone. Csaba Vass replied that each deputy was expressing his own viewpoint in the vote, as is his sovereign right.

On Saturday Imre Pozsgay, whom the congress approved as the MSZP candidate for the post of president of the republic, began his election campaign. He took part with Party Chairman Rezso Nyers in a political festival in the city of Szeged. The festival had a dual purpose. On the one hand, to familiarize the city residents with the MSZP's program and to recruit new members to the party's ranks and, on the other, it was Imre Pozsgay's first meeting with voters.

The Hungarian Democratic Forum has also put forward its candidate for the presidency. The second National Conference of this major and most authoritative opposition organization, which has over 20,000 members, was held Friday through Sunday. The Hungarian Democratic Forum was created in September 1987 as a broad social movement and was transformed into a party in March of this year at its first National Conference. The forum now has 327 organizations operating in the country; these mostly unite representatives of the intelligentsia. Many people are predicting success for the Democratic Forum in the spring parliamentary elections, noting that its candidates won three districts out of four in the by-elections held in the summer.

The Hungarian Democratic Forum's candidate for president is 58-year-old Lajos Fur. During the 1956 events he was secretary of the so-called revolutionary committee in Hajdu-Bihar Megye. On 4 November he was arrested by Soviet troops and interned. After his release he lived for a while in France. Now he is a lecturer at Lorand Eotvos University in Budapest. All this information is from the official biography of the candidate circulated at the conference.

Nevertheless, probably no event in recent days has prompted such debate as the anniversary of the start of the 1956 events. Back in the summer the Budapest MSZMP City Committee proposed marking 23 October as a day of national reconciliation. The opposition proposed making it a national holiday and a day off. An MSZP Congress resolution made public only last Friday proposed, on the basis of the idea of national reconciliation, deeming 23 October to be national remembrance day. Once again, parliament made the decision. Its deputies voted that this year 23 October should be an ordinary workday, but its future fate will be determined by a nationwide referendum. The solemn ceremony proclaiming the Hungarian Republic was scheduled for 23 October...

It was a summery day, warm and sunny. Thousands of people went to the festively decorated parliament building in Kossuth Square to take part in this historic event. Classes were cancelled in many schools. When noon had struck, Matyas Szuros, chairman of the National Assembly, who is acting president pending the elections, announced from the balcony of parliament that henceforth the state is to be called the Hungarian Republic.

In his 15-minute speech M. Szuros spoke of the main directions in state policy, whose main aim is to create in Hungary an independent democratic rule-of-law state. I have to note that when M. Szuros moved on to questions of international policy and stated that the development of equal relations with the great neighbor—the Soviet Union—accords with Hungary's national interests, the crowd hissed his words. But the next sentence, about the desire for cooperation with the other great power—the United States—was greeted with applause by the meeting. I know that by no means all Hungarians would have reacted like that. Our country has many sincere and faithful friends in Hungary. Nonetheless, the hissing in the crowd is a certain indicator of the antisocialist and anti-Soviet sentiments that are becoming widespread in the country.

Thugs from the October Party staged a "celebration" on Sunday in Corvin Alley—the alley where there were many insurgent forces in 1956. Slogans like "Hungarians, let's start over!" and "Russians go home!" and the frankly anticommunist remarks of the "speakers" left no doubt as to the political orientation of the organizers of the assemblage. Dummies in jackets and trousers were dangling from a rope nearby. A label bearing the name of a Hungarian party figure or statesman was pinned to each. Commentary is superfluous here; moreover, there were very few people in the alley.

This episode alone shows that in the contradictory situation prevailing both within Hungary as a whole and within the party itself much effort and energy will have to be expended before the MSZP is firmly on its feet. The party must arrive cohesive and organized at the upcoming presidential and parliamentary elections.

### Hungarian Democratic Front Leader Cited

*PM2410134189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4*

[Dispatch by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Hungary: Opposition's Steps"]

[Text] Budapest—Although the date for general elections in Hungary, to be held on a multiparty basis, has not yet been announced, just as the date of the presidential elections has not been announced, the election campaign itself has essentially already begun. Election congresses of the opposition parties, which already number over 15, are taking place in the country. Among them it is the congress of perhaps the most influential opposition party—the Hungarian Democratic Forum [HDF]—which has attracted special attention.

There are now about 800 local divisions of the HDF operating in over 120 of the country's population centers. The forum is most frequently spoken of as the party or movement of the intelligentsia. Indeed, its ranks probably include more writers, historians, political scientists, journalists, and sociologists than any other party, which gives the forum its strong intellectual potential. With time the movement has also acquired its own working council.

Summing up the main provisions of the political, economic, and foreign policy programs discussed at the congress recently, we could describe their overall orientation as a confirmation of the course of the "Hungarian third way" which rejects equally the practice of "state socialism" in the East European countries and the Western market economy model. In the economic field the HDF program outlines the gradual privatization of inefficient state enterprises together with the intensification of the role of local self management, workers' councils, and various public organizations and foundations. The creation of a rule-of-law independent state and democratic self-management are the basic elements of the political program. In the foreign policy sphere the HDF will seek good-neighborly relations with the East and the West and the democratization of the Warsaw Pact so that the Hungarian armed forces cannot be used against other peoples. As a long-term goal the program proclaims the attainment for Hungary of the status of a neutral country like Austria or Finland.

"For us good relations with the USSR and the United States are equally important," Jozsef Antall [surname as transliterated], one of the leading figures of the HDF, said in a talk with your IZVESTIYA correspondent.

He is the man whom Western journalists frequently refer to as the "Hungarian Mazowiecki," regarding him as a likely candidate for the post of head of a future coalition government. While we were talking in the intermission between sessions, votes were still being counted after the election of the HDF chairman. A little later it became known that my interlocutor, the 57-year-old historian, director of the library and archives of the Budapest museum of medicine, J. Antall, had been elected party chairman.

"How many votes does the HDF count on obtaining and what are the chances of creating a coalition with other parties?"

"I believe that the HDF can gather at least 30 percent of votes but perhaps even more. As for creating a coalition after the elections then, in my personal opinion, considering all the economic and political circumstances, a future government in Hungary cannot be created without the Hungarian Socialist Party..."

The progress of the election campaign and feelings in the country will indisputably be influenced by how today, 23 October, the anniversary of the 1956 events, passes. The solemn proclamation of the Hungarian Republic on the square outside parliament—in accordance with the country's altered constitution—is scheduled for that day. In the evening a mass meeting is expected here held by the "23 October committee" which unites a number of radical opposition parties and organizations. The republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs urged the organizers to refrain from the display of extremes which could undermine the country's prestige.

## Correspondent on Hungarian 1956 Anniversary Fete

*LD2410223689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2006 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] The world press is broadly commenting on the proclamation of the Hungarian Republic and the events within the framework of the day of national reconciliation. Our correspondent Yevgeniy Shirokov reports:

[Shirokev] [video shows crowded square in Budapest] On October 23, 1989 the old barricade which had been covered with the blood of many innocent victims and which had invisibly divided people of the same nation, was finally broken. And many of the newly formed organizations, speaking against mistakes of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, were tirelessly attacking Hungarian Communists for not having a clearcut concept regarding the 1956 events.

Until recently, heated arguments did not want to die down, regarding what was happening a counterrevolution or a revolution. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, beginning with the May conference last year, conducted in-depth scientific research into that period. Facts were broadly discussed in society. The document Lessons of the Historical Path adopted at a recent congress of the Hungarian Socialist Party says: On October 23d 1956, a popular rebellion flaired up in the country in order to remove the remnants of Stalinism in Hungary and to renew socialism. However from the very first days of the events, antisocialist forces tired to take advantage of the rebellion in their own interests. People whom we saw yesterday at the rallies, of course, interpret the lessons of the historical past in different ways, from their personal positions. After all, among them there were those who fought on this side of the barricades, and there were others who fought on the opposite side of the barricades. The annuls have preserved everything. Let us give their due to the participants of the peaceful gatherings yesterday. Nowhere did we observe any attempts to disturb order in any way, nor any instigatory violent expression of emotion in the speeches. And just imagine, we did not come across a single drunken person in the streets and squares solidly crowded with people. This is truly a good example to follow. It is symbolic that precisely on that day on the Kossuth Square, near the building of Parliament in the presence of tens of thousands of people the creation of the Hungarian Republic was ceremonially proclaimed. This is the name henceforth of the country which is now revising its past and insistently seeking a way for renewal through the struggle waged by its different forces. Democratic Socialism—this is how the aim of the Hungarian society has been formulated today. Ahead is a serious test for democracy which is trying to assert itself—the election of the country's president, elections to the State Assembly, something which will be held for the first time in the conditions of the multiparty system.

### Role of Hungarian State Council 'Enhanced'

*90UI0071A Moscow TRUD in Russian*
*21 Oct 89 p 3*

[TRUD correspondent A. Komrakov report: "Hungary: Sharp Changes"]

[Text] Budapest, 20 October—These days Hungarian television and radio are working overtime carrying a direct relay of the session of the State Council. The speeches of the deputies, breaking through the city noise, are heard through the windows of apartments and establishments and the doors of the stores and hairdressing salons. The parliament of the Hungarian Republic is passing laws that are rightly being called fundamental here: The country's future will largely depend on them.

From the standpoint of the newspaper NEPSZABADSAG one of the most important provisions in the introductory article of the new Constitution are the words that the party cooperates in expressing the will of the people but does not possess direct power; no party has the right to control any government body.

In the transformed Constitution the role of the State Council has been significantly enhanced. Now it alone, and by a two-thirds majority, can declare a state of war, conclude a peace, and form the defense council and the Hungarian parliament, and it has essentially been transformed into a permanent body—its sessions will last from early February to mid-July and from 1 September to 15 October.

The country's armed forces may cross its borders only with the permission of the parliament except for cases in which this is associated with the fulfillment of international obligations that Hungary may assume, as, for example, participation in joint exercises or service in the UN forces to maintain the peace.

The present session of the State Council is of special interest to the country. For, apart from the amendments to the Constitution, it must also reach decisions on other very important issues. I am writing these lines as I watch a direct television broadcast from the parliamentary session: It has been decided that henceforth parties may not engage in their activity at work places...

It is planned that the session will last at least until noon on Saturday. During that time it will have to discuss questions concerning elections to the new State Council, and the general election that must define the state emblem and what holidays will be observed. In particular, a proposal has been put forward to make 23 October a national holiday to mark the "anniversary" of the 1956 national uprising.

Speaking at the session, Hungarian Socialist Party Presidium member M. Nemeth said: "The country's government intends to rely on all the forces represented in the parliament that are guided in their activity first and foremost by the interests of the nation. We consider ourselves a government whose political course is leftist and socialist."

It is difficult to say how these words were accepted by the members of the opposition party. Although there are scarcely a dozen so-called opposition people among the parliamentary deputies, the authority of the parties that they represent does influence the course of work in the parliament. The Alliance of Free Democrats, for example, has collected more than 100,000 signatures calling for the country's president to postpone elections until a new parliament has convened. By law this is enough to organize a national referendum. Time will tell how the dispute is resolved.

### Delays in Rail Deliveries From CSSR Explained

*PM2310132989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin reply to reader's letter under the rubric "Dialogue. Readers Ask, Reflect, Advise": "Warehouses on Wheels"—first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] "We have recently heard it said that it is altogether impossible for goods due to be delivered to us by Czechoslovakia to cross the border. This was even said by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in an interview with Central Television. What has caused this situation?"

V. Osipenko, Novosibirsk City.

Prague—The situation now prevailing along the Czechoslovak-Soviet border can be described as an emergency. There are 50 abandoned trains on the Czechoslovak side of the border zone. According to preliminary estimates, they contain consumer goods worth R400 million. These are primarily sewn goods, knitwear, footwear, children's clothing, medicines, and much else.

Furthermore, there are 500 cars with similar goods from the FRG, France, and Italy held up on Czechoslovak territory. These are the very articles which are in acutely short supply in our market. They could appear on store shelves tomorrow but, as local railroad workers declared, the USSR Ministry of Railways refuses to accept trains from Czechoslovak territory. This situation has prevailed for more than a month now.

The USSR Ministry of Railways and the CSSR Ministry of Transport conclude annual agreements covering the delivery schedule for boxcars to border stations. According to this schedule, the Ministry of Railways must accept 11 trains from the Czechoslovak side daily. There have been recent occasions, however, without a single train being accepted.

"We have sent several urgent telegrams to the Ministry of Railways leadership," R. Piskoppel, USSR trade representative to the CSSR, said. "But we receive formalistic replies instead of the problem being solved. Some telegrams have failed to elicit any response at all."

An entire train carrying footwear was put together on Czechoslovak territory at the Trade Mission's suggestion. A telegram asking that it be accepted was sent to the Ministry of Railways 12 October. No reply to it had been received by the end of last week.

In view of the complex situation, which is an emergency to all intents and purposes, the USSR Trade Mission to the CSSR suggested that part of the footwear be shipped using truck convoys. True enough, this would have increased delivery costs, but by only R15,000, which is insignificant from the viewpoint of wholesale deliveries. Alas, Soviet organizations refused to pay this money.

Breakdowns in operations by Soviet railroad workers have created a serious problem for a whole series of major Czechoslovak heavy industry enterprises. Since the start of this year, deliveries to metallurgical plants have fallen short of contracted quantities by 500,000 tonnes of iron ore raw material. Coal delivery contracts are not being fulfilled. And winter is only around the corner...

"In my view, an emergency situation requires emergency measures," according to R. Piskoppel.

### Freight Trains for USSR Held at PPR-GDR Border

*PM2410152289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Own correspondent S. Baygarov report: "Impasse on... the Border: Why Freightcars Have Accumulated at GDR Stations"]

[Text] Berlin, 23 Oct—Some 25 trains have accumulated on the border between the GDR and Poland, each of them comprising 45-50 freightcars carrying freight for the Soviet Union, your correspondent was told at the USSR trade mission in the GDR. Some 90 percent of this freight consists of consumer goods: clothing, detergents, furniture, cosmetics...

Why are trains filled with goods that would sell out instantly in our country's cities and villages at a standstill? Let us look at the chain of events. Poland is not allowing these trains through its territory, because its railmen do not want to jam their tracks with trains from the GDR. The reason—Brest is not able to handle rapidly the necessary number of freightcars. See how the echoes of the recent hitches on our railroads have snowballed and rolled as far as the border and beyond, and are now hitting Soviet consumers hard.

Economic law decrees that everything that is produced must be sold rapidly. Here, too, the picture is worrying: The warehouses, yards, and shops of GDR enterprises oriented toward the Soviet market are packed with goods. Approximately 40 percent of the economic potential of the GDR, employing nearly half the country's working population, is "tied" to the Soviet Union. And now let us put ourselves in the place of the enterprise leaders. What are they to do? Stop production? Or urgently seek new markets...

A paradoxical situation is developing: Through our own lack of resourcefulness and disorganization we are creating difficulties for a reliable partner who for many years, regardless of external or internal difficulties, has regularly delivered consumer goods to the Soviet market.

## West Europe

### NATO Ministers Welcome Shevardnadze Statement

*LD2510082989 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Quinta do Lago, Portugal, October 25 TASS—NATO defence ministers at a regular session of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group here have praised Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's statement of the Soviet Union's readiness to promote the disbandment of the military-political blocs in Europe on the basis of reciprocity.

They also welcomed the idea of eliminating foreign military bases and military presence on other people's territories by the year 2000, a spokesman for the Portuguese Defence Ministry told journalists on Tuesday.

In the opinion of many participants, these initiatives open up new prospects for East-West relations, the spokesman said.

The NATO defence ministers are satisfied with the course of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe and expect that it would be possible to sign a comprehensive treaty to this effect in the first half of next year.

## Gorbachev Begins Official Visit to Finland

### Departure for Helsinki

*LD2510084989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] A report has just been handed to me in the studio.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee left Moscow for Helsinki for an official visit on 25 October at the invitation of President of the Finnish Republic Koivisto.

Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; Vyalyas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party; Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom; and Kovalev, first deputy foreign minister, are accompanying Gorbachev on his trip.

Mikhail Serveyevich Gorbachev was seen off at the airport by members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Comrades Zaykov, Kryuchkov, Medvedev, and Ryzhkov, and Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Among those who saw him off was [Oinonen], temporary charge d'affaires of Finland in the USSR.

### President Koivisto's Welcome

*LD2510090189 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Helsinki October 25 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Finland today.

At Vantaa airport, where the state flags of the two countries were hoisted, the Soviet leader and his wife were welcomed by Finnish President Mauno Koivisto and his wife.

### Talks With Koivisto Begin

*LD2510125289 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Helsinki October 25 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Finnish President Mauno Koivisto began talks here today, with the main focus on bilateral relations, the situation in Europe and urgent international issues.

The Finnish press and the Soviet delegation express conviction that the talks and meetings in Helsinki will give fresh impetus to the European process, help plan and build the common European home. During the visit a number of bilateral agreements in political, economic and other fields will be signed.

The two leaders know each other well, since the current talks were preceded by numerous meetings between Gorbachev and Koivisto in Moscow. The last time the Finnish president made an official visit to the Soviet Union was in 1987.

## Media, Officials Preview Gorbachev Finland Visit

### Gorbachev Foreword to Book Presented

*PM2510113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Book Launched"]

[Text] Helsinki, 24 Oct—Numerous members of the public and local and foreign journalists gathered in the capital's "Kalastajatorppa" Hotel today. It hosted the official ceremony to launch "There Is No Alternative," an anthology of speeches and writings by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The book has been published in Finnish by the Werner Soderstrom Publishing House jointly with the NOVOSTI Press Agency.

M.S. Gorbachev writes in the anthology's foreword:

"Esteemed readers of this book in a friendly country!

"This anthology of my writings, the third to be published in Finland, covers the period between April 1987 and June 1989. That was a time of major events in the Soviet Union and all over the world.

"The first Congress of USSR People's Deputies was one of them. Despite all the diverse opinions about it, it has already gone down in history as a major landmark in the Soviet state's political development.

"It was a genuine people's congress. It reflected the full spectrum of Soviet society's political, economic, social, and ethnic interests. It promoted the unprecedented boosting of the political awareness of millions of Soviet people and their involvement in lively political activity, in work to prepare new conditions and forms of social life. It raised democracy and glasnost to a new level and strengthened the guarantees of perestroyka's irreversibility. This is what makes it important as a watershed and a landmark.

"The congress, and the first session of the new Supreme Soviet which took over its mighty democratic impetus, marked the beginning of a new stage in perestroyka's progress in all spheres of Soviet society. A process of renewal is also spreading to the CPSU, the initiator of perestroyka and the generator of its ideas, plans, and initiatives. Major changes are forthcoming here, too.

"You know that perestroyka processes in our country are not running smoothly. Their results are still not as tangible as we would like them to be everywhere. In some regards, we have already advanced quite a long way—this applies primarily to democratization and glasnost. There are places where perestroyka is still not all that noticeable, as well as places where it is in a skid. We perceive this, and we are learning to solve in a new fashion the tasks we have inherited from the past and those generated by the revolutionary transformations of the present. Perestroyka is our destiny. It is a unique opportunity offered to us by history to renew socialism and to implement genuinely socialist ideas and principles, we have no alternative to it. The peaceful revolution aimed at the socialist renewal of the entire Soviet society will attain its goals. That is the will of our people, of our party.

"I hope that the material in this anthology will help Finnish readers to gain a fuller impression of our activity in the international arena as well. Let me mention just one point here: Perestroyka has fundamentally changed our attitude to the world around us. Today, more than ever before, we are open and sincerely ready to cooperate with all who perceive human life and dignity as the supreme values. We perceive perestroyka itself as part of the process of democratization of the entire world order, which is gathering pace. We are building our foreign policy in the firm belief that, no matter what barriers may separate states and people with their different convictions and beliefs, we all are children of this earth and share the same main concerns—survival and progress in conditions of freedom of choice. This is what guides us in acting to promote a transition to a period of peace, of nuclear-free and nonviolent coexistence between all peoples and states.

"Movement in this direction is already under way. International tension is no longer at fever pitch. There is no longer a direct threat of nuclear war. Nuclear arsenals are being reduced. A start has been made in unblocking regional conflicts. The Vienna meeting gave a new impetus to the Helsinki all-European process. For the first time in the postwar years, the level of military confrontation in Europe, the most dangerous in the world, is declining. Our recent visits to Britain, the FRG, and France and our contacts with the Council of Europe proved that the initial outlines of the all-European home are beginning to take shape.

"Of course, the international community still faces plenty of unsolved problems. This also applies to the northern part of our continent. But the prospects here are also quite good. I outlined our view of the problems existing here in Murmansk on 1 October 1987. You will find the text of that speech in the anthology.

"And finally, I shall very soon be visiting Finland, a good neighbor which Soviet people treat with profound respect, a country which deservedly enjoys universal respect for its lengthy and imaginative work, persistent work in the face of all the ups and downs of international life, to the benefit of peace and mutual understanding, a country which has justifiably lent the name of its capital to the most important avenue for the progress of international relations toward a new age.

"I have already had numerous occasions to speak of the unique nature of Soviet-Finnish relations. The importance of the experience accumulated here extends far beyond the boundaries of bilateral relations.

"I am convinced that the forthcoming talks with Finland's state leaders and the meeting with its people will make our good-neighborliness and friendship even more dynamic.

"I wish peace and prosperity to the book's readers and to all Finns!"

The publication of a new book is always a joyful occasion for a publisher, Antero Siljola, general director of Werner Soderstrom Publishing House, said at the ceremony. Today's occasion is doubly joyful—Finnish readers are receiving M.S. Gorbachev's book on the eve of the Soviet leader's arrival in our country. The thoughts he expresses about perestroyka in the USSR and about the most important problems now perturbing all mankind are close to the hearts of, and are understood by, the Finnish people. We welcome M.S. Gorbachev's arrival in Finland. We are confident that this visit will help to strengthen our traditionally good-neighborly and friendly relations.

## Helsinki News Conference Held

*LD2410230789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1421 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Helsinki, 24 October—TASS correspondent Vladimir Dodonov reports: A common home for Europe." This was the theme of the regular press conference which took place today in the Soviet Information Center on the eve of the visit of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee General secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The choice of this theme is determined by the urgency of the problems of normalization and of significantly improving interstate relations in Europe which will be raised in the course of the visit. And the very stay in Helsinki, with whose name the origin of the all-European process is linked, does not make it possible to ignore them, A.A. Lebedev, chief of the Ideology Department sector of the CPSU Central Committee, who opened the press conference, stated.

The interest in the press conference was so great that G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Directorate, was surrounded by journalists and television camera operators as soon as he entered the room and the press conference began before it was officially opened. The significance and the role of the forthcoming visit of M.S. Gorbachev to Finland, the evaluation of the processes taking place now in the socialist countries of Europe from the point of view of implementing the idea of building a common European home, cooperation of scientists in the struggle for peace, and the affirmation of the new political thinking, and also the prospects of Soviet-Finnish commercial and economic cooperation were of interest to those who had gathered.

Answering one question, A.A. Lebedev, who was chairing the press conference, noted that for a long time now Soviet-Finnish relations have been considered a model of goodneighborliness and of cooperation among states with different social structures and which are so different in many other areas. However, these relations are now acquiring more and more a broad general European dimension, which the forthcoming visit by M.S. Gorbachev here bears witness to, he stressed.

Work in the Soviet Information Center is being carried out very actively. Over the past few days, members of the press group have already given over 20 interviews to representatives of the Finnish and foreign mass media. Journalists of practically all major Finnish newspapers, the radio, and television have been at the Soviet Information Center press conferences or held individual interviews with members of the Soviet press group. Moreover, members of the press group are meeting with their Finnish professional colleagues and with representatives of political parties and social organizations.

We are completely satisfied with the interest which is being shown in the visit of M.S. Gorbachev, A.S. Grachev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and head of the Soviet press group, said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. This interest is expressed in the fact that a large number of journalists have come here from various countries of the world, that there are many representatives of the Finnish mass media, and finall,, in the serious nature of the questions asked which touch upon the restructuring processes in our country and the restructuring of international relations, friendly ties between the Soviet Union and Finland, and the development of the general European process, A.S. Grachev noted.

## TASS Assesses Ties

*LD2510094989 Moscow TASS in English 0933 GMT 25 Oct 39*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent Igor Peskov:

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev departed today from Moscow for Helsinki on an official visit at the invitation of President Mauno Koivisto of Finland.

The visit is in tune with a long-standing traditional meetings between Finnish and Soviet leaders and confirms good-neighbourly relations between the two countries.

These relations are stable, and we can say with satisfaction that there are no serious political problems between the Soviet Union and its northern neighbour.

The Finnish and Soviet leaders repeatedly stressed the unique nature of Soviet-Finnish relations based on the rock-firm foundation of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. At the same time the sides should be concerned with tackling tasks facing the two countries. In this context we should single out, above all, economic cooperation which has become very broad.

The USSR is the largest trading partner of Finland which, in turn, is among leaders in Soviet trade with capitalist countries. However, an imbalance emerged in their trade relations several years ago due to reasons provoked largely by the situation on world markets.

The two countries are trying to eliminate this imbalance. The Soviet Union hopes that the forthcoming talks in Helsinki anda five-year agreement on trade to be signed during the visit can create conditions for resolving this problem as well as for the planned and purposeful expansion of economic cooperation.

The world's accelerated development preconditions the emergence of new aspects in international relations. The USSR now pays much attention to the expansion of cooperation between neighbouring countries in ecological issues.

The planned signing in Helsinki of a bilateral agreement on the environment should be regarded as an important move in this direction.

Soviet-Finnish relations have always been an example for relations between states with different social systems and made a positive contribution to European cooperation initiated by the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In Helsinki the two sides will have an open and detailed dialogue on political issues, the economy, culture, ecology and humanitarian cooperation. The Soviet Union hopes that this dialogue will help raise good relations between Finland and the Soviet Union to a higher level.

## Yakovlev Interviewed on Relations

*LD2410222389 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1600 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Politburo and CPSU secretary responsible for foreign policy, considers the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union exemplary. Yakovlev will be a member of the delegation accompanying President Mikhail Gorbachev on his visit to Finland starting tomorrow. Yakovlev thinks that the practical results of the visit will concentrate on economic matters, reports Martti Hosia from Moscow.

[Begin Hosia recording] The mutual relations between Finland and the Soviet Union are unique. This is how brightly the present situation is described by Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Politburo and Central Committee secretary responsible for international affairs. Yakovlev, who is member of President Mikhail Gorbachev's entourage, gave an interview to Finnish Radio and Television on the eve of the visit. In fact the relations between the countries are so good that, according to Yakovlev, it is difficult to reply to the question in which direction they could still progress. It is true that Yakovlev added hastily to his own assessment that the possibillities are limitless. Also important is how the political development of the world is jointly described during the forthcoming discussions. Concrete issues are concentrated on the economy. Yakovlev mentioned separately the plans for the Kola Peninsula.

When examining the situation in the entire north of Europe Yakovlev noted that even during the cold war the north was a more secure corner of the world than average. This is due to the Soviet Union's good neighborly relations with Finland, the neutrality of Sweden, and to the fact that Norway, which is a member of NATO, has not permitted nuclear weapons on its territory. To the question of Finnish interest in whether the Soviet Union regards Finland as a neutral country or as a country striving for neutrality, Yakovlev replied evasively. The most important thing is not the name, but the fact that Finland does not want to fight against anyone. Finland is not subjected to the dominating influence of any country, but it can observe an independent domestic and foreign policy. Concerning the sometimes mentioned revision of the YYA Treaty [Finnish-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance] Yakovlev noted that the best must not be an enemy of the good, in other words, the treaty is good in the form it is written.

In the north, the Soviet Union still supports the plan, going back many years, for a nuclear-weapons free zone. The Soviet Union is prepared to guarantee the zone, either alone or together with other states.

To the question about Finland's participation in the West European integration, Yakovlev said outright that he could not reply to it. If there is debate about the matter in Finland, it means that the Finns themselves do not agree about the matter. The process of integration, as such, Yakovlev regarded as a natural matter.

In the interview, which covered an extensive area, Yakovlev also discussed the big power relations. The burden of armaments has brought us to the brink of a precipice, from where we must escape as soon as possible. The Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional weapons and the Geneva talks on the halving of strategic nuclear weapons are occuring in a good atmosphere. I think that at the next summit meeting of the big powers, we can expect real results. We are moving towards a world without weapons and wars, the thoroughly optimistic Yakovlev assured. [end recording]

## 'Open in-Depth' Talks Predicted

*LD2410150789 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—By TASS Diplomatic Correspondent Igor Peskov:

President Gorbachev's official visit to Finland, which will start tomorrow, continues the long-standing tradition of meetings between leaders of Finland and the USSR. It is a reflection of the good-neighbourly relations existing between the two countries.

These relations are stable and we appreciate the fact that there are no serious political problems between the Soviet Union and its northern neighbor. The leaders of both countries have repeatedly noted the singularity of Soviet-Finnish relations resting on the solid foundation of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance.

The Soviet Union is Finland's major trading partner, while Finland holds a leading place in Soviet trade with capitalist countries. However, a disbalance has developed in commercial relations between the two countries in recent years due to reasons that do not depend on either side. It was caused mainly by the international market situation. Both countries are now striving to level out trade.

It is hoped in the Soviet Union that the forthcoming Helsinki negotiations and the five-year trade agreement that are to be signed during the visit, will contribute to the solution of this problem, and will promote a steady and purposeful expansion of bilateral economic cooperation.

World developments give rise to new aspects of international relations. The Soviet Union is now paying special attention to the expansion of cooperation with neighbouring countries in ecological matters. The bilateral agreement on the environment, which the sides expect to sign in Helsinki, is an important step in this direction.

Soviet-Finnish relations have always been an example for states with different social systems. They have made a positive contribution to European cooperation ushered in by the Helsinki CSCE Confernce.

An open in-depth dialogue will take place in the Finnish capital on problems of political, economic, cultural, ecological and humanitarian cooperation. The Soviet Union believes it will help to elevate Finnish-Soviet relations to a qualitatively new level.

## IZVESTIYA Sets Scene

*PM2510115189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1*

[Dispatch by special correspondents S. Kondrashov and V. Shmyganovskiy: "Frank Discussion Ahead"]

[Excerpts] Helsinki—M.S. Gorbachev's long-awaited visit to Finland has become an imminent reality after the press here published the program of the Soviet guest's stay in the land of Suomi. The visit begins 25 October and will last 3 days. Its program is full to bursting: talks with President Mauno Koivisto and other Finnish leaders, conversations with representatives of business circles, meetings with ordinary people. The signing of a number of important joint documents is provided for. In addition to Helsinki, the high Soviet guest is to visit the city of Oulu in the north of the country.

We have good reason to write the word "long-awaited." The visit had been scheduled for last year but then was postponed several times. It has to be said that the postponements gave rise to certain questions, but people in Finland realized that it would be hard to find another head of state now with such a large load as M.S. Gorbachev. The intensive course of the political reform, the acute situation in the Soviet economy, interethnic problems and contradictions... All this dictated the daily routine and, for the time being, deferred the trip to our closest neighbors. As Finnish President M. Koivisto said recently in an interview with Soviet journalists, our relations are increasingly characterized by stability, continuity, and predictability. There are no problems between the two countries in the political sphere, the Finnish and Soviet leaders emphasize. [Passage omitted]

However stable our political relations are, there are people who would like to introduce new emphases to them. Certain hotheads are ready to question even the 1948 Soviet-Finnish Treaty as supposedly not in keeping with the contemporary situation. They demand that the country's government make official contacts not just with various movements in the Baltic republics but, above all, with those representatives of them who campaign for secession from the USSR. The Finnish leadership takes a firm stand and answers in the spirit that relations between states presuppose a dialogue between the two governments, not between the government of one country and public organizations in the other. It invariably emphasizes the fundamental significance of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance for our time, too. Evidently taking advantage of the economic difficulties in the USSR, representatives of certain parties in the Finnish Parliament are putting forward options to "redeem from Russia" part of Karelia. The president has been asked: Will he discuss this problem at the meeting with the Soviet leader? M. Koivisto replied in the negative.

Let us stipulate that all this, after all, falls within the bounds of political life in a democratic country. At the same time no serious politician in Finland questions the significance of Soviet-Finnish cooperation. And M.S. Gorbachev's visit is regarded as an important new boost to the development of relations between the two countries. People here expect a particularly great deal from the Soviet guest's speech scheduled for Thursday in the famous Finlandia Palace.

"The Soviet leader always has something new in reserve," we were told.

## Finnish Foreign Minister on Visit

*PM2510103389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 First Edition pp 1, 4*

[Special correspondents V. Drobkov, Yu. Kuznetsov, B. Orekhov dispatch: "Suomi Is Expecting a Distinguished Guest"]

[Excerpt] Helsinki—And so the capital of Finland is once again a focus of European political life, on this occasion in connection with the visit of the Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev. In the opinion of many Finns, the visit should consolidate and expand the traditions of good-neighborly relations and cooperation in the most varied spheres which already exist between our countries and outline their continuation in conditions where major changes for the better in interstate contacts are taking shape in Europe and a switch can be perceived from confrontation to the establishment of businesslike, mutually advantageous partnership.

Processes of this kind evoke unconditional approval and satisfaction from the inhabitants of Suomi. After all, they essentially confirm the correctness of the foreign policy course steered by that country, a policy whose cornerstone has been and remains the 1948 Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance. This document—unique in the practice of the Soviet Union's relations with capitalist countries—enshrined for the first time in the form of treaty commitments such all-embracing principles of international life as respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, independence and equality, noninterference in internal affairs, renunciation of the use of force, and mutually advantageous cooperation in the interests of international security.

At that time certain spiteful Western critics, as we know, invented the term "finlandization" in an attempt to cast aspersions on the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. It has now become obvious that these multifaceted relations are the only possible and natural relations in our time. And, moreover, they essentially pointed the way toward building relations between states belonging to different political systems. It was not by chance that Urho K. Kekkonen, in his capacity as president of Finland, declared that "finlandization"—that is peaceful, equitable, and mutually advantageous relations with the Land of the Soviets—would, frankly, benefit many other states, too.

The Finnish political leadership and the entire people attach very great significance to M.S. Gorbachev's visit, Pertti Paasio, Finnish foreign minister and chairman of the country's largest political party, the Social Democratic Party, told PRAVDA's special correspondents. We are thinking about both bilateral relations between our states and the development in Europe as a whole in a period when great changes are under way there. There are many points of contact between our countries, and we have the same approach to a whole series of problems including foreign policy issues. As for our relations, they are developing very successfully and have, by dint of this fact, become a genuine example of both cooperation between states with different social systems and also, simply, cooperation between two states, one large and one small.

The head of the Finnish foreign policy department noted the unquestionable importance of our countries' close cooperation on specific, topical questions, and in particular the protection of the environment. We have a long common border, and there is much work to be done in this sphere on both sides of it.

And of course, the minister emphasized, no effort must be spared in imparting new impetus to disarmament processes, and in particular the Vienna talks. Here confidence-building measures are of the utmost importance. The countries taking part in these processes, and this includes Finland and other nonaligned and neutral states, must "build bridges" in a joint effort. The Soviet Union has shown understanding of Finland's stance in this respect, of the policy which it has tried and is trying to implement in this context. It seems to us that so far we have been fairly successful.

People here, P. Paassio went on, are following very attentively the perestroyka processes which are under way in the Soviet Union. Naturally, these processes are accompanied by certain difficulties, yet there are no instances of major transformations in world history which did not run into problems. However, even great difficulties are surmountable, provided they are not merely registered but also tackled.

The Finnish press is devoting much attention to the upcoming visit. [passage omitted]

### Vatican Official Cited on Gorbachev Visit to Italy

*PM2410131189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4*

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report: "Many Common Topics"]

[Text] Paris, 23 Oct—The forthcoming talks between Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev and Pope John Paul II during the latter's visit to Italy will have a positive effect on relations between the Vatican and the USSR, believes Frank Rode [name as published], secretary of the papal council for dialogue with nonbelievers.

I believe, he stressed in an interview with a TASS correspondent, that M.S. Gorbachev and John Paul II have many common topics to discuss—for instance the problem of building an all-European home and disarmament. The Vatican has always welcomed actions leading to arms reduction.

F. Rode noted that relations between the two sides have changed and these changes are directly linked with perestroyka in the Soviet Union. The USSR's new course, he said, has considerably improved these relations—the time of tension is passing, rapprochement is ensuing, and some previously insurmountable difficulties are being resolved.

### Ground Forces Chief Varennikov Leaves for Norway

*PM2410133189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 First Edition p 3*

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Army General V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, left Moscow for Oslo 23 October on an official visit at the invitation of Major General A. Sollie, chief inspector of the Norwegian Ground Forces.

## Latin America & Caribbean

### Nicaragua's Ortega Grants Interview to PRAVDA

*PM2310140189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 89 Second Edition p 7*

[Correspondent V. Listov dispatch on interview with Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega: "Daniel Ortega: 'We Are Going Our Own Way'"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Managua-Mexico City, Oct—The coordinator of the Executive Commission of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN] and president of Nicaragua chats with PRAVDA's correspondent.

...He sat behind the wheel and motioned to me with a nod of his head: "Get in beside me." And the jeep moved off. On leaving the Sandino Airport grounds, we sped along the highway leading to Managua. A police car ahead of us with "flashers" on its roof cleared the way, and other drivers, evidently accustomed to such situations, obediently pulled over to the side while we passed them without slackening our speed and rushed through intersections.

Everything indicated that the president of Nicaragua, seated behind the wheel, was preoccupied with his thoughts. USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze had just concluded a visit to the Nicaraguan capital, and Daniel Ortega seemed to be going over and over the details of the talks in his memory. I waited for him to break the silence himself.

"Well, what do you say?" he finally addressed me without taking his eyes off the road.

"I am surprised," I replied.

"At what?"

"That they let you drive a car, and at such speeds, too. As you yourself pointed out, you have just had very important talks. Tomorrow you are leaving for Europe and Arab countries. Nevertheless, you are driving somewhere, and at this time of night, too," I said, taking advantage of a pause.

"All this is so," D. Ortega replied, "but I must drive to Catarina. A routine meeting is taking place there within the framework of the 'Face to Face with the People' program, and I promised to participate in it. Such meetings have become a kind of revolutionary tradition."

We made our way out of Managua quite quickly, and "quintas"—small, well maintained private farms with clean little houses surrounded by coconut palms and fruit trees—now stretched on both sides of the highway. Beyond them could be seen pastureland alternating with banana plantations and cornfields.

"And so..." Daniel Ortega said and looked at me inquiringly.

I did not keep him waiting:

"The 10th anniversary of the Sandinist revolution was celebrated recently. What is the chief result of these 10 years and what, above all, characterizes the present political situation in the country?"

"I will remind you first of all that the past years have been years of U.S. aggression. Therefore the chief result is the fact that we have held out and repulsed all attacks by the armed counterrevolution. We have also withstood the economic blockade organized by the United States. In short, we have achieved peace. This is the chief point.

"The country and the Sandinist revolution are now entering a new decade," the president continued. "Its initial landmark will be the general election due next February. Of course, imperialism has not abandoned its plans to eliminate our revolution, but whereas throughout the first decade our enemies were gambling on military and economic aggression and using the right-wing political opposition only as an adjunct to armed struggle, the situation has now turned through 180 degrees. The center of the struggle has shifted to the political sphere. The armed actions of the Contras are used only as a 'second front'—that is, to support the opposition's political activity—while U.S. economic aggression is continuing with its former force."

"There are 4 months remaining until the elections, and practically all political life in Nicaragua is subordinate to them. What is their significance for the country and its future?" I asked.

"Although Washington is now sharply stepping up anti-Sandinist activity," D. Ortega replied, "we have the support of the people and we will undoubtedly win the elections, and by an overwhelming majority—I am convinced of this. This will give the Sandinist revolution a big advantage, for this will be its second most significant victory after July 1979. The next decade is to be a time of reconstruction and stabilization headed by the FSLN."

"Will the 'Panama option' be repeated in Nicaragua?" I expressed a doubt. "In Panama, too, the local reaction kept on about a 'lack of freedom' and 'inevitable fraud' long before the elections, and Washington did not hide the fact that it would not recognize the voting results if the opposition did not win..."

"We have drawn lessons from the Panama events. In Panama the United States succeeded in interfering directly in the elections. Things are different here. We have resorted to the services of foreign observers. They have been following the preparations for the elections right from the start. We have nothing to either fear or hide. UN and OAS special missions can obtain all information of interest to them and also receive protests with regard to any violations of the electoral process from all parties without exception."

Daniel Ortega spoke unhurriedly, and you could sense that he was voicing thoughts which he had considered repeatedly:

"We have always proceeded from our country's specific nature, from its history and realities. We have always gone and now go our own way and have made creative use of revolutionary theory both during the struggle against the dictatorship and in the process of peaceful building. Of course, we could not fail to take account of the experience of other revolutions, but our Sandinist revolution triumphed because it was not a mechanical copy of them, and our program of national reconstruction was also our own. We at once took national democratic, anti-imperialist positions and joined the Nonaligned Movement. Over the past years we have succeeded not only in preserving this line but also in enriching revolutionary practice."

"It is known that there have also been false steps in this quest..."

"And how!" Deep furrows appeared on the Nicaraguan president's forehead. "Take the nationalities question. At first we botched things with the national minorities, particularly with indians of the Miskito tribe. For example, we transferred to them work methods which were used in other, far more developed zones. Things are now being put right on the Atlantic coast.

"In the production sphere and the social sphere we wanted to do everything at once and, at the same time, to restructure the country quickly, in 2-3 years. That mistake, which seems characteristic of all revolutions, created disillusionment among the people. But people realized that we wanted to improve their life as quickly as possible, that we were proceeding from the best intentions.

"The blunders in agriculture were of special significance, since Nicaragua is an agrarian country," D. Ortega continued. "At first we wanted to create large state farms, but what happened? Medium-size private farms frequently found themselves within their boundaries, and their interests were thoughtlessly infringed. That was unjust, it was a mistake. It was necessary to increase production, but it fell. It was necessary to strive to intensify farms, but we took the path of expansion, of enlarging state farms.

"We quickly realized that this was not our way, and we set about rectifying the mistakes. We began implementing the idea that public ownership means not just nationalization, not just a decisive role for state organs in the management of enterprises but, above all, the direct participation of working people themselves in all the affairs of their own enterprise. They must know everything: production, expenditure, profits, difficulties, and prospects—in short, feel that they are the real masters not in theory but in practice."

"Abrupt turns usually elicit an abrupt response. How was it in your case?"

"This was the case. This aroused universal approval among Nicaraguans, which meant a sharp change in the sentiments of a considerable section of the population in our favor. In many Latin American countries this gave rise to hopes that in our region, too,! the revolution might develop and progress without 'statism,' without the use of forcible methods of management, but there were also those who accused us of departing from the revolution and all but betraying it."

For a while silence reigned in the vehicle. A lava-covered expanse was passing by on our right, with the gray mass of the Masaya volcano forming a backdrop. It was beginning to grow dark.

"You want to know, of course, the essence, the core of the abrupt turn that we made," the president resumed the conversation. "It is that we confirmed that we were not repeating anybody's experience, not taking anybody's path, but continuing the search for our own.

"We changed our attitude to Christians and, as a result, secured their involvement in political life, and very many of them have sided with us."

The police "pilot" vehicle braked and turned off.

"One more question, Comandante: As candidate president of the republic for the FSLN, what are you emphasizing in your election campaign?"

"The problem of deprived children," he replied without a moment's hesitation. "We are obliged primarily to improve the position of children. After 10 years of revolution Nicaraguan children are in a simply dreadful situation. This is no credit to the revolution, even taking account of the war conditions and the economic blockade."

San Juan de Oriente—a small settlement where squalid huts line both sides of the main street—greeted us with garlands of small red and black flags, the symbol of the FSLN, and groups of enthusiastic young people. Adults waved from their doorways, greeting the president of the republic.

Young people ran after the vehicles and, when they stopped in the settlement's small square, a seething crowd at once emerged all around. "What do the people want?"—"Daniel for President!"—the Sandinistas' election slogan rang out over their heads. "You will see..." D. Ortega managed to say to me and made a farewell gesture of his arm. The crowd caught him up, his aides and bodyguards, and a group of U.S. pacifists who somehow also found themselves there, and surged onto the highway linking San Juan with Catarina.

When we reached Catarina, the entire population had already gathered in the floodlit main square. I will not relate the course of the meeting. It was a truly open and frank dialogue between the people and their president. The finale was a speech by D. Ortega in which he expounded the main points of the FSLN election platform and the immediate tasks which the Sandinist government has set itself.

...Driving away from Catarina accompanied by the crackle of festive fireworks, I could not help thinking that the now traditional "Face to Face with the People" meetings conducted by the FSLN leaders are just what Daniel Ortega had said in our conversation—a manifestation of the uniqueness of the Nicaraguan revolutionary process and a characteristic feature of its own, Sandinist path to a better future.

### PRAVDA on End of Arms Supplies to Nicaragua

*PM2310134389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[B. Pavlov reply to reader's letter under the rubric "Dialogue. Readers Ask, Reflect, Advise": "With Utmost Clarity"—first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] "For several months now we have stopped delivering weapons to Nicaragua. In my opinion, this is a very responsible and well-timed step which therefore merits proper appraisal in Washington. Why do people over there constantly try to belittle the importance of our peacemaking action, pretending that it produces hardly any practical results?

"I. Pravov, history teacher, Moscow City."

PRAVDA's correspondent obtained official confirmation from the USSR Foreign Ministry Latin American Countries Administration that the decision to halt supplies of weapons to the Nicaraguan Government, made by the Soviet Union by agreement with Nicaragua's leadership, is being implemented in full and without any deviations. **Our country—and this must be noted with the utmost clarity—now does not supply any arms to Central America.**

At the same time, the Soviet Union disagrees with the artificially broad interpretation of the term "weapons" and attempts to interpret it as including trucks, tents, medicines, and so on. Some Western mass media are making untenable attempts in advance to pin on Moscow the potential responsibility for any deliveries that the Nicaraguan Government could, in principle, agree upon with third countries. Quite naturally, we are responsible only for our own actions in such an event.

At the same time, as M.S. Gorbachev said in Havana, the key and long-term goals of a Central American settlement would be met by an "end to military deliveries to Central America from whatever source." Incidentally, Nicaragua is prepared to renounce right away all imports of arms and military equipment provided that the Contra formations completely cease combat operations against the republic. But if attacks by the insurgents are resumed with fresh vigor, the Nicaraguan side will notify all interested states that it has been forced to purchase weapons abroad.

Nonetheless, nobody must labor under the false impression that Nicaragua has been abandoned to its fate as a result of the Soviet peace initiatives. On the contrary, our assistance, like, clearly, help from the entire world community, will continue but in a greatly changed form, because the Nicaraguan revolution itself is entering a new and peaceful stage of its development.

Finally, another essential point. The leadership of the foreign policy department does not consider itself empowered to determine the future nature and volume of cooperation linking us with Nicaragua. The appropriate decision on this question must be made by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

## Nicaragua's Tinoco on Contras' Disbandment

*LD2010175989 Moscow TASS in English*
*0924 GMT 20 Oct 89*

[Text] Managua October 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov:

Disarmament and demobilisation of Nicaraguan contras in Honduras remains in the spotlight of the Nicaraguan Government's attention. The local authorities are alarmed by the fact that the counter-revolutionary leaders have advanced unacceptable demobilisation terms under the recent visit paid to Honduras contras camps in Jamales Department by members of the international commission supervising the disbandment of anti-Sandinist formations.

Francesc Vendrell, one of the leaders of the international commission consisting of representatives of the United Nations and the Organisation of American States [OAS], told newsmen that the main obstacle to demobilisation is the contras' mistrust of the Sandinist government.

Political commentators in the region believe that this "mistrust of Sandinists" is a smokescreen behind which the contras wish to conceal their unwillingness to comply with the demobilisation decision passed by the presidents of Central American states. It stipulates that the demobilisation should be completed before December 5 of this year.

Victor Hugo Tinoco, the Nicaraguan first deputy foreign minister, told TASS that during talks with representatives of the international commission in the Jamales the contras did not even touch on the question of guarantees which the Nicaraguan Government was ready to grant them after demobilisation and voluntary repatriation. Eager to drag out the question, the contras advanced so-called political demands which go beyond the competence of the Honduras agreements and have nothing to do with demobilisation.

Hugo Tinoco noted that the Nicaraguan side had grounds to believe the United States was endeavouring to prevent the demobilisation. Honduras has assumed a dual stand. On the one hand, the Honduras Government does not want the anti-Sandinist formations to remain in its territory and, on the other, refuses to bring pressure to bear on the contras to make them leave Honduras.

"The U.N. and OAS international commission," Hugo Tinoco noted, "has positively assessed the Sandinist government's measures to guarantee the security of demobilised contras. It believes them to be very concrete."

"If the contras are not demobilised before December 5," the deputy minister said, "it will mean that Honduras has failed to comply with its Tela commitments. In that case, Nicaragua will resume its action against Honduras in the Hague international court for allowing mercenaries to use its territory for aggression against Nicaragua. Nicaragua will again raise the question of contras demobilisation at the next meeting of Central American presidents in Managua."

Hugo Tinoco qualified as extremely important Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's initiative that the USSR and the United States should assume the status of guarantors of a Central American regional balance of forces agreement. The Soviet minister advanced this proposal during his recent visit to Nicaragua.

"It is not ruled out," Hugo Tinoco stressed" that the Soviet initiative will be discussed by Central American presidents during their forthcoming Managua talks".

## U.S. Policy Toward Cuba, Central America Hit

*PM2410124789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Vitaliy Korionov "Viewpoint": "Better to Consider the Beam in Their Own Eye"]

[Text] Washington is displeased. For decades on end it has been trying to isolate Cuba and surround it in some sort of "quarantine zone." This was primarily by way of punishment for the fact that Cuba pursues an independent policy and courageously upholds its national interests and its socialist option. Washington firmly opposed proposals to elect Cuba a nonpermanent member of the UN Security Council.

Suddenly these efforts have failed. The current UN session elected Cuba a nonpermanent member of the Security Council for a 2-year term. Cuba gained a record number of votes: 146 out of 156—which attests to its high international prestige.

Washington became indignant. The State Department issued a special declaration in an attempt to "lecture" a sovereign country on the way it ought to behave in the Security Council. Havana is instructed "to act constructively to end regional conflicts, not contribute to them." This is an attempt to convince people that Cuba supposedly fans such conflicts. Further demands are made of Cuba "to behave in a manner consistent with the UN Charter and the resolution calling on member states to observe the provisions of the Guatemala agreements and the joint declaration, especially those concerning the cessation of aid to irregular forces or insurgent movements in the region."

You read these lines, and the wise biblical advice automatically comes to mind: "Why do you look at the speck in your brother's eye, but not consider the beam in your own eye?" After all, if anyone ought to be advised to honor international agreements, it is primarily the makers of Washington's Central America policy.

It so happened that, on the very day the U.S. State Department came out with its aforementioned declaration, the National Assembly in Managua made a resolute protest against U.S. interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs. In the resolution they have adopted, the parliament's deputies perceive the U.S. Congress' decision to finance the election campaign of the National Opposition Union [UNO], which operates in the republic and unites rightwing parties, as damaging to the Nicaraguan people's interests. The document demands of the U.S. Congress and Administration not to interfere in the electoral process in Nicaragua and to respect the agreements signed by the Central American presidents.

The general election scheduled for next February will be exceptionally important for Nicaragua. Imperialism, in its efforts to suffocate the Sandinista revolution, has hitherto banked mainly on military aggression. This has proved useless. The struggle's center of gravity has now shifted to the political arena, even though neither the contras, thousands of whom are entrenched in Honduras, nor subversive economic methods have been abandoned.

Everything is now being done to ensure that the forthcoming election is a lever for crushing people's power in Nicaragua. Senior U.S. State Department spokesmen have publicly announced that the Nicaragua election is a "game field." At the end of last week President Bush signed a draft law, approved by the U.S. Congress, appropriating $9 million to finance the UNO election campaign. This step was perceived as "immoral" in Managua. The White House action prompted protests from the so-called "leftwing" opposition, in other words parties not belonging to the UNO. Voices of disagreement can also be heard on Capitol Hill. Senator Brock Adams, for example, says: "I think that we should not interfere in Nicaragua either with bullets or with ballot papers."

But interference in the internal affairs of other peoples is not limited to Nicaragua alone. Much material has already been published, attesting to Washington's direct involvement in the recent coup attempt in Panama. This attempt failed, but the administration has certainly not given up its intention to overthrow General Noriega's regime. The U.S. Secretary of State publicly declares: "We are prepared to apply all the means available at our disposal to achieve this goal." Please note: "all the means available..." It is indicative that, following the failure of the coup attempt, CIA Director W. Webster, who is now being accused of indecisiveness, has been insisting on the need to rid the CIA of "excessive Congressional control," to lift the ban on special service agents' activity associated with political assassinations, and to expand the CIA's field of activity "for future operations."

These are just a few facts which confirm time and again that the United States is whipping up tension in the Central American region. It is that country's influential circles that are undermining the Guatemala agreements and keeping "irregulars" like the contras afloat.

It appears that the U.S. State Department declaration on Cuba's election to the Security Council primarily pursues the goal of discrediting Havana's policy in order to divert world public attention from Washington's unseemly actions. But this attempt to shift blame from the guilty to the innocent is hardly likely to bring its instigators any success.

## Soviet Friendship Award for Cuban Official

*PM2310155789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Soviet Award Presented"]

[Text] R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, presented the Order of Friendship of the Peoples to Zoilo Vidaurreta Marinello, president of the Cuban-Soviet Friendship Association, 19 October.

R.N. Nishanov cordially congratulated Zoilo Vidaurreta Marinello on the award, which marked his great services to strengthening and developing friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the Republic of Cuba and the Soviet Union.

Zoilo Vidaurreta Marinello expressed his gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet state for their high assessment of his activity. The award, he stressed, obligates me to work even more vigorously to consolidate the fraternal ties between our two countries' publics.

Julio E. Camacho Aguilera, Cuban ambassador to the USSR, attended the award ceremony.

## Supreme Soviet Session

### 23 Oct Supreme Soviet Session on Moscow TV

*LD2410170689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Recorded relay of USSR Supreme Soviet session 23 October at the Kremlin in Moscow]

[Excerpts] [Sobchak] Esteemed, Anatoliy Ivanovich! In connection with our discussion of a whole series of laws on property, on land, on taxation, on leaseholding relations, the need arises for the introduction of serious amendments to the USSR Constitution on the abovementioned questions, that is on questions of the economic system and so forth.

So, we are now proposing to the Supreme Soviet to examine the question of the introduction of changes only in the electoral system. In what way and how will we examine the question of the introduction of changes in other sections of the Constitution which ought to be introduced at the same time as these laws at the congress?

[Lukyanov] Thank you. Comrades. We were, of course, concerned with that question during dissussion of the agenda. In the agenda of the Supreme Soviet, only the bill on changes and additions to the Constitution on the electoral system was included, as you recall, and that was the task handed down by the First Congress of People's Deputies. However, each of you who has held in his hands the draft law on property saw that this law also has attached a draft law on changes to four very important articles of the Constitution. Each of you who receives the draft bill on constitutional supervision will also see that it is proposed there also.

That is the view of the commission, that there is a need to change the Constitution. That is, by the time of the congress we will have dealt with a greater number of changes to the Constitution, but every time we will prepare such a draft bill which, when it is adopted, will at the same time approve the draft law on the changes to the Constitution, in parts, so to speak. They will all be gathered at the Congress of People's Deputies for changing. Moreover, I would say that some republcs—well, Comrade Gorbunov is here—think that there is also a need to introduce changes into certain articles connected with Federation. That is also a most serious question and it will be connected with the expansion of rights of the union republics and the introduction of republican financial autonomy and with other measures, which were envisaged here. It is a question both of union republics and of autonomous ones, too. However, all that must be done part by part, because if one talks on the whole, preparation is under way at the same time, and there are already some drafts of bill for a new Constitution of the USSR in which all these amendments already, obviously, so to speak in a unified context, ought to be reflected at least.

[Gorbachev] Comrade Gorbunov, please.

[Gorbunov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, perhaps I haven't understood you precisely. Therefore I have a clarification question. You said that at the sitting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet all chairmen of the presidiums of the republics spoke out against direct elections of the chairmen of the soviets and, if in a republic, then against the examination of presidential status in the republics.

If that is so, then I would like to say, nonetheless, that I did not express such an opinion, but on the contrary, I expressed the following opinion. In our republic a discussion is now under way, not only on direct elections of the chairmen of the soviets but also on presidential status, on administrative or authority in the republic. And I really... [changes thought] while the discussion is going on of that draft which has been worked out by the Society of Jurists in the republic, it is now being discussed in the republic. Under no circumstances can I affirm one or another point of view. There will be a session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic on 10 November and then it will be decided if there will be direct elections or not. Therefore, I did not express such a viewpoint at the presidium.

[Lukyanov] I want to tell you what I said. It should be noted that neither in the commission for the preparation of the draft bill, neither at the sitting of the Presidium did the proposals for establishing the post of president of the republic or a chairman of the soviet find the support of the majority. Of the majority, I said it precisely.

[Gorbachev] Please.

[Kudarausakas] Kudarauskas, Lithuania. Well, as we can see, a great deal of work has been done here in coordinating various points of view existing in different republics. But all of this relates purely to the remit of the republics. So don't you think it is possible to replace all of these articles of the Constitution with one article, that the formation of supreme power in a union republic and of local authorities is carried out according to the constitutions of the union republics?

[Lukyanov] If the principle is observed of unity of the system of soviets, built on the foundations, as Lenin said, of socialist federalism and democratic centralism, then certain principles regarding the structure of the Soviet system in the union as a whole, that is, also including a union republic, have to be preserved in the Constitution. The point is that a series of measures have to be adhered to in this matter, and this measure, which opens up all the possibilities of the republics, is in our view adhered to here.

[Gorbachev] Comrade Gryazin, please.

[Gryazin] Greatly respected Anatoliy Ivanovich, simply since this question is of fundamental significance, excuse me if I repeat myself, but in fact I want to receive an exceptionally precise reply, which, during the voting, I had no doubts about whatever. Who, for example, decides the question: Will, for example, Latvia, or Estonia, or any other republic, have its own president, and how will it go about electing him? Who will decide this? A majority of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, or the republic itself, by a majority of votes? That's the first question. The second question, and this will be all: From the point of view of the principle of dividing power, the combination of the functions of speaker and president is manifestly not rightful. Why this occurs here in the Supreme Soviet is clear, and there are clearly no objections here on the part of anyone. Does this mean that the rejection of the principle of division of power, that is, the combination of the functions chairman of parliament and president, should in fact be implemented everywhere and at all times? Thank you.

[Lukyanov] We have discussed this question very carefully, very carefully, and thoroughly. We discussed it because this is linked with the overall system of soviets and the Soviet form of administration. If a new post is introduced, the post of president, then the correlation changes, and the division also, the demarcation of power, between the representative organs of power—they serve only legislative functions—and between the executive organs, and the judiciary. What functions will the president have here? That's the first question which we have to reply to. How will he correlate with the Soviet? And for this reason, at the commission, a majority of comrades, and also at the Supreme Soviet Presidium, said that this doesn't fit into the system of soviets. This will run counter to the authority of the soviets, and another official is being created who is not actually subordinate to the soviet, because he will be elected directly by the population. Finally, this could lead to a great concentration of power in one person's hands. In practice, in that case, if a post of president is introduced, there is a change in the entire distribution of functions between the organs of the state, and a new power appears—presidential power. In this regard, these norms have not been stipulated in the USSR Constitution. How will things develop from here—let them prompt us how they will develop. In this sense this question is quite serious. But we have stood in favor, from the very outset, since the 19th party conference, in favor of preserving the principles of the Soviet form of administration, the Soviet form of power of the peoples, in which such a supreme official in the state would not only fit into the supreme representative organ of power, but would also be elected by it and would be fully subordinated to this organ.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead.

[Magomedov] Magomedov from Dagestan. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich. [voice of previous speaker Gryazin is heard faintly, asking for an answer to his question]

[Lukyanov] Where will it be stipulated?

[Gorbachev] No, wait, the second question. The republics.

[Gryazin] Who will decide?

[Lukyanov] I think that in order to introduce presidential power into the republics or to introduce presidential power into the system of soviets will require a decision on amending the union constitution—and you know who has to alter that.

[Magomedov] Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, I would like an amplification of article 96, paragraph 4: Persons forming part of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Councils of Ministers of the union and autonomous republics, Executive Committees of local soviets of people's deputies—with the exception of the chairmen of these bodies—leaders of departments, sections, administrations, and executive committees of local soviets, judges, and state arbiters, cannot be deputies in a soviet which appoints or elects them. Does this include leaders and heads of departments—it's written thus: Leaders of local procuracies and People's Control committees. What is to happen to them?

[Lukyanov] The point is that representatives of the procuracy in the localities are not elected and are not ratified, but are appointed by a superior procurator. As far as People's Control Committees are concerned, they are elected and they are covered by the rule of no more than two terms in office that is in the constitution.

[Magomedov] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Please, go ahead.

[Pribylova] Deputy Pribylova of the Committee on People's Health Care. Deeply esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, most of the discussion on the electoral system was really aroused by elections from public organizations. Those changes that have been introduced into Article 95, in general, reflect the state of this discussion, when voters from public organizations failed to reach a single view, or is this not so? What is your view? It would probably be more democratic if we were to supplement the final part of Article 95 with the following paragraph: Some people's deputies of the USSR—I am reading—and also some people's deputies of the union and autonomous republics, if this is envisaged by the constitutions of the republics, are elected from public organizations, with subsequent elections according to constituency. This would be a united approach and would be more democratic. Thank you.

[Lukyanov] I have to tell you that certain republics are envisaging doing precisely that, and all ways must be thorougly tried. As far as representation from public organizations is concerned, at the present stage—as the USSR Congress of People's Deputies showed and as the work of the Congress and of the Supreme Soviet shows—this principle is now justifying itself at the highest level. That is my standpoint and if you wish it can be developed.

[Gorbachev] Please, go ahead.

[Fokusov] Deputy Fokusov, from the city of Izhevsk. Anatoliy Ivanovich, I have a continuation of Pribylova's question: Does the second part of Article 95 contradict Article 97, i.e., on the right of election of one—one person one vote—and elections from public organizations. If the clause proposed by deputy Pribylova were to be entered, would they not then cease to be mutually exclusive?

[Lukyanov] No, then there would be even greater confrontation between these principles. I have to say this, comrades, quite frankly, as a lawyer and as an official in soviets for a lengthy period of time: The principle that the provision for the election of some deputies from public organizations is allegedly, in direct contradiction to the principle of one voter - one vote - one deputy does not hold water. In itself, if one looks more deeply into it, at issue are totally different things. It is a matter of representation in the supreme bodies of power of corporations and specific social strata of the population; and this practice is applied not just in our country. It is applied in a number of other countries.

This representation in no way coincides with elections according to territorial and national-territorial constituencies. If, however, it were proposed to us, as was proposed at a sitting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium—Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov proposed that it should be added to this article that these elections are conducted by direct, secret, and equal ballotting of all members of public organizations. Even if such a principle as this was introduced then this would mean not the representation of public corporations, but rather double and triple representation in the hands of large groups of the population. For example, 120 million trade union members, 80 million cooperatives, 40 million Komsomol members, and so on, would immediately receive two votes.

And what about women, what about veterans who were represented, and who, let's say it outright, would not be in our representative bodies but for this representation? That would cast doubts also on the authority of the deputies already elected from social organizations. And this is also very substantial, comrades. This was spoken of very heatedly at the Presidium. In the Republican laws unfortunate incidents such as those which occurred in the representation of small social formations can be avoided, and that is why the Republics are taking different channels to resolve that question. The representation of social organizations on the whole has always, from our point of view, been justified. And there is no contradiction here at all. It will develop for the Union Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and be operational for the Union of the SSR on the basis of articles 95 and 109 of the Constitution where the number of such representatives is established, and on the basis of Articles 18, 36, 39, 51 and other articles on the election of people's deputies of the USSR.

[Bogdanov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, Bogdanov. There have been many proposals on, well, Article 100. The electoral commission which is formed from representatives of work collectives will guarantee the holding of elections. But by whom is the electoral commission itself ratified? That is, ordinary work collectives are represented. However, it seems to me that the electoral commission, too, that the constituency electoral commission ought to be ratified by someone subsequently.

[Lukyanov] It is made up of representatives and moreover, in various republics there are various norms included now, and there is no need to resolve this in the constitution. And all sorts of questions are resolved very thoroughly in the law on elections of USSR people's deputies and in the laws on election in the Union republics.

[Bogdanov] But it isn't ratified by the constituency.

[Lukyanov] What?

[Bogdanov] It isn't ratified by the constituency. Let's suppose there are electors who do not agree with such representation and we cannot stand in the way of that.

[Lukyanov] Well, so the electors don't agree, the electors haven't yet expressed their opinion fully, that is, not all of them took part, but...

[Bogdanov] I have in mind breaches during separate...

[Gorbachev interrupting] You asked a question. Listen to the answer.

[Lukyanov] Those organizations and collectives, those labor conferences which participated in proposing the candidate members of the commission expressed their opinion. That is the basis of any electoral system. First, a system, so to speak, of bodies which work on proposing candidates, deputies, needs to be formed and then already the voters need to be given the opportunity to decide who to elect.

[Bogdanov] And furthermore, still on the same Article 100. The right to propose, labor collectives, social organizations, collectives of secondary special and higher educational establishments. That means schools are discriminated against. The labor collectives of the school, under the above-mentioned article, are discriminated against. That is, schools, just higher and secondary.

[Lukanov] The teachers' labor collective is not discriminated against.

[Bogdanov] Why then, are higher, secondary, special and higher educational establishments singled out?

[Lukyanov] That was a proposal by the committee of youth organizations and the majority...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Let's do it this way. Either take the floor to speak or to ask questions, and listen to the answer. Comrade Kirillov please.

[Bogdanov] Very well, then.

[Kirillov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, I would like to ask a question. Under the decision, is it envisaged before the adoption of this decision, to hand over the draft laws on changes to the constitution for study in the committees and commissions. I mean that, with all due respect for the Presidium, we had an agreement that before such laws are adopted, the committees and commissions will examine these questions.

[Lukyanov] I do not exclude such a possibility. We naturally could not hand it over before the Presidium had approved or decided to hand over that draft for your examination, on the 20th [October], that is on Friday. You understand that. As for the committees and commissions, then the chairmen of the committees and commissions received that draft on Wednesday—last Wednesday [18 October].

[Gorbachev] (?a question for) comrade Lukyanov.

[Lukyanov] If they are adopted, then let's decide.

[Deputy] She's been waiting a long time.

[Unidentified Woman deputy] So, please, Article 96, final paragraph: Psychiatrically ill citizens, judged by a court not to be in full possession of their faculties, and also persons being deprived of their freedom may not take part in elections.

Could one not clarify, bearing in mind the presumption of innocence, the persons being held in places depriving them of freedom, and exclude from this the isolation cell for those under investigation?

[Lukyanov] No, unfortunately not. This principle is a principle tested by practice. I know what case the respected deputy is speaking of, and even in this case we have to take as a starting point the fact that persons in detention cannot stand as candidates.

[Woman] Then we must clarify what detention—places of detention—means.

[Lukyanov] We discussed this specifically, and these places of detention are very clearly defined in our corrective labor legislation and in other legislation of the USSR and the union republics.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead.

[Yaroshinskaya] Deputy Yaroshinskaya, Glasnost Committee. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, I have two questions for you. First, it is well known that the last election campaign showed that the overwhelming majority of electors, at least in my constituency, do not accept elections from public organizations. So I think that Article 95 should nevertheless be changed. It seems to me that a compromise is possible here. I think that...

[Gorbachev interrupting] One moment, comrade. Is this a speech or a question?

[Yaroshinskaya] No, a question.

[Gorbachev] Ask your question, please.

[Yaroshinskaya] So what do you think? I want to propose a compromise and hear your opinion: To do away with elections from public organizations, and at the same time to give them the right to put forward candidates, but they would have to be elected according to territorial constituencies.

[Lukyanov] The right for public organizations to put forward candidates has existed as long as Soviet power has existed.

[Yaroshinskaya] I know, but...

[Lukyanov interrupting] This has been the case and will remain so in the future. As for elections from public organizations, let's not beat around the bush. Different opinions are being voiced. The republics are being given the possibility to decide this question themselves. For the USSR, this question was decided by the constitution and the election law, and there are no grounds to cast doubt now on the authority of a large part of deputies of the Union. This was the conclusion reached by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the comrades who took part in it.

[Yaroshinskaya] Thank you. I have a second question, if you'd be so kind. Article 100 says that any number of candidates can be included on the voting list. What does any number mean? Obviously is also means one person? Does it mean that one-candidate elections will be possible again? Thank you.

[Lukyanov] When we speak of any number of candidates included on the voting list, of course alternatives were discussed and for a long time we had this alternative. The number of candidates included on the voting list must exceed the number of existing deputies' seats. Not simply two, but actually to exceed, because you could have a constituency with many seats. A constituency with many seats. Let's say, if a village has 25 deputies to elect, 27 are put on the list.

Others proposed at least two. But this principle is not suitable because you can have a constituency with many seats. Still other comrades told us of the huge difficulties we would come up against in rural areas, where just one person might be put forward for a constituency. There are not so many candidate deputies there. A fourth group of comrades, spoke of the practice of withdrawing candidacies just before the elections. In particular this happened in a lot of elections in the Baltic republics, and the Baltic comrades said: What kind of alternative can you have when there is one candidate on the list for secret voting, particularly when we are talking about 2,300,000 candidates? There you are. And finally, the practice in other countries. You know, we analyzed all these practices. There are some countries which prescribe, for example: There cannot be included fewer than two and more than seven, or more than five, candidates on the voting list. But we came to the conclusion that in this case the preservation of this article in the constitution, for any number of candidates, would provide for all possibilities. Many comrades spoke on this question, and in the end this is the conclusion they reached. [15 minute break in Supreme Soviet session]

[Unidentified speaker] Esteemed Anatoliy...

[Gorbachev interrupting] I beg your pardon. Comrade Denisov, go ahead.

[Denisov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, perhaps you could comment on the need to maintain the congress of the soviets of the union [as heard] bearing in mind that it is an economic burden, is technically difficult, and—in the formal sense—generally undemocratic. Thank you.

[Lukyanov] Anatoliy Alekseyevich, if you remember my speech at the congress, I said that such an alignment of this very broad and representative forum at a period in perestroyka when we had to take in all aspects of society's life and find out the mood of all strata—the length and breadth, so to speak—at this stage, the congress justified itself 100 percent, from our point of view. It allowed us to see the society we have, with all its moods—pardon me—both ethnic and social and ideological—all of them. The time may came when this system will have to be changed, but perestroyka itself—revolution in revolution—demanded just such a body, and this was supported by the people in the constitutional change. Perhaps in time, when an overall review of the constitution is undertaken, we will arrive at other conclusions. However, at present, in my opinion, there are no grounds for this assertion.

[Denisov] I agree that the Congress justified itself. I have no objections on that score, but perhaps we've had enough? [general laughter]

[Lukyanov] I believe this proposal will be discussed in the Constitutional Commission, the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of the People's Deputies itself.

[Krasilnikov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, this is from Deputy Krasilnikov: Does it not seem to you that Article 100 contains a contradiction? On the one hand, the complete right is granted to public organizations to nominate candidates, but on the other hand this right is hedged around by the laws of the USSR union republics, particularly on who can nominate to what bodies?

[Lukyanov] Who can nominate, you mean?

[Krasilnikov] It's written here: Bodies and organizations with the right to nominate candidates as people's deputies from public organizations, are defined by the relevant laws.

[Lukyanov] Yes.

[Krasilnikov] At the same time, Article 100 says that public organizations have the right to nominate.

[Lukyanov] Yes. The general principle is that they have the right to nominate, but first of all there is the question of who they are, what organisations...

[Krasilnikov interrupting] Apparently that's up to you?

[Lukyanov] No, it has to be defined, but it will be a republican one for a republic; it will be a union one for the union; but for a town a Society of Lap and Decorative Dog Lovers could be just such a society! There, it must be clearly defined by law what societies and what bodies will nominate. This will be envisaged in republican laws.

[Gorbachev] Comrade Balayan, go ahead.

[Balayan] Anatoliy Ivanovich, according to Article 145, the bodies of state power in administrative divisions and autonomous bodies, starting with autonomous oblasts, are formed in accordance with the laws of the union and autonomous republics.

[Lukyanov] Yes.

[Balayan] What, in your opinion, should happen if an autonomous body is in a republic where constitutional law is in operation under which the right of the republic to withdraw from the USSR is proclaimed, and a referendum of the entire population of the republic is announced?

[Lukyanov] We are aware of this amendment to the constitution in the republic you are talking about. As far as the question of how constitutional an amendment on the possibility of scrapping a particular division is how to go about withdrawing etc. is concerned—this question must be discussed. As for the general principle enshrined here, it does not contradict that which can and should be done on the territory of each republic within the framework of the law and the constitutions of the autonomous republics and of the law on autonomous bodies on the territory of the republics. This includes the law on autonomous oblasts and the law on autonomous okrugs.

[Balayan] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead.

[Zolotukhin] Deputy Zolotukhin from Tashkent. Anatoliy Ivanovich, the clause on constituency election meetings that was so unpopular has disappeared from Article 100.

[Lukyanov] Yes.

[Zolotukhin] To what extent will this provision be binding on the union republics? And my second question: Where is the borderline where these clauses become binding for union republics, too? And what innovations specifically can be introduced to the constitutions of the union republics within the framework of this law?

[Lukyanov] They can introduce any innovations into the constitutions of the union republics and the election laws of those republics. I have already reported...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] If they don't contradict.

[Lukyanov, continuing]...that some of the republics—if they don't contradict the general principles of the electoral system. I have reported to you that some of the republics have completely ruled out constituency assemblies. Some of the republics have left them only for the higher bodies of power, and have not left them for local ones. Some of the republics have envisaged very real limitations for their elections, so each republic has acted in its own way. I believe that the very best criterion for truth is practical experience. Once practice has been established, perhaps in the new all-union law we shall determine these questions in a different way. We simply have to make a trial. There hadn't yet been any practical experience when the all-union law was being created. It was determined only by union law.

[Gorbachev] Your question, please.

[Chelyshev] Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich. Deputy Chelyshev. Doesn't it seem to you that we are being very quick about giving possibilities for the creation of republican public organizations, and new all union public organizations, and giving them on a large scale, which will automatically get the right to put forward their candidates? There could be countless numbers of such organizations. They will take up everything. That's one question. Question number two—I'll be very brief. Don't you think that in Article 100, one could do it so that on the voting paper—as is written here—any number of candidates can be inscribed, ensuring a choice at elections. To correct it in that way.

And the last thing. It seems to me that if we write that the election campaign is provided for at the state's expense, does that mean that works, institutes, schools and so on will no longer be able to take any material part—not offer transport, leaflets and so on, to their candidates?

[Lukyanov] Thank you. The first question: The number of social organizations in the republics will of course increase, because even in elections to the union they grew like mushrooms in order to get registered, and only the Central Election Commission was able to evaluate this question. The fact is that the republics must define this more clearly in their election laws.

As for the formulation: Any number of candidates; in my opinion choice is indeed laid down here. It could be depicted somehow in another way—I described other formulations to you. Choice is laid down here.

As for equal bases for the candidates, this principle must be observed. It is observed throughout the world. There exists the most detailed legislation on this question, including financial legislation. It wasn't us who worked it out. It is essential that it should be observed, because as the union elections showed, there were very many violations here. Both on the one side and on the other, as they say.

[Chelyshev] Does that mean that works—works, schools, public organizations—will now be able to offer...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Comrade Chelyshev, this is now a discussion, and this must be raised in a committee.

[Lukyanov] Candidates must have equal conditions.

[Gorbachev] Your answer, question, rather.

[Deputy] [name indistinct]. First, I consider it is a misprint, not Chapter 45 [as heard], in Chapter 19, but article...

[Lukyanov, interrupting] What? What?

[Deputy] Here in Chapter 19, Article 145—not Chapter 145, but Article—I think this is a misprint. Second, a supplement to a supplement. I would like you to explain what is meant by: And in other administrative-territorial units there have been formed [words indistinct].

[Lukyanov] I can explain. It's about this, comrades. What do we get with administrative-territorial units? Let's say, there are stanitsa [Cossack villages] soviets, Kishlak [Central Asian villages] soviets, aul [Caucasian villages] soviets, apylinke [Baltic villages] soviets they have in the Baltic. Some republics are talking about the possibility of setting up uyezds and volosts [small pre-revolutionary administrative divisions], national rayons, national rural soviets. why should we put all this into the constitution? That's what is meant by this term.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead.

[Nikolaychuk] Deputy Nikolaychuk. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, as is well known, the constitutions of the republics provide for changes not only directly in the electoral system, but also in the status of people's deputies. Why should we not envisage lifting restrictions—I am thinking of Article 104 of the USSR Constitution—and give the union republics the right to determine the status of their deputies themselves?

[Lukyanov] It seems to me that the status of a deputy—if we have a single system of soviets—the status of a deputy should in principle be a single one too. It is another matter if the republics can provide some sort of supplementary possibilities for their deputies, depending on the administrative-territorial division and the other republican divisions. However, everything else to do with the status of a deputy should be one and the same in principle.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead, Comrade Shcherbak.

[Shcherbak] Deputy Shcherbak from Kiev. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, I am in some doubt as to the legality of the second clause in the draft decision, where it is stated that it is possible to make changes to republican legislation on the election of people's deputies within the framework of the draft of this law. Would it not seem to you that expediency is being placed above the letter of the law, and that we are possibly creating a very dangerous precedent, although I am in favor or adopting it?

[Lukyanov] Yes. Yes, as a lawyer it does seem that way. However, one law has already been passed in Kazakhstan. So, how could we proceed? We could proceed either just as the Presidium suggested after lengthy and, let's say, intricate discussion; we could pass this draft on to Congress deputies—circulate it among them; or we could postpone elections in the union republics until such time as it is confirmed—this is quite a realistic option. For the time being we suggest this option. It does not tie the hands of the republics, and is based above all on the fact that so much has been spoken here about the sovereignty of republics. As I said, it is as though all-union and republican legislation are interwoven, but your question is a logical one.

[Shcherbak] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Please go ahead.

[Kolesnikov] Deputy Kolesnikov. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, we all know how difficult it is to work in even just the one soviet. Experience of the work here has shown this. I mean Article 96. What is the basis for the possibility in Article 96 for [illegible]SR citizens to be elected as people's deputies to two so[illegible]s? Will this not have an adverse effect on the work of th[illegible]oviets generally?

[Lukyanov] This principle was thoroughly discussed in the course of the amendments to constitutional legislation as a whole. If we want linked soviets -each link connected with the one above it, let's say - then this principle must be retained. Can you imagine a rayon soviet in which there is not a single village soviet chairman? I cannot. Because then we do not have the opportunity for people to express from the localities the view of a whole soviet. The same relates to other soviets. At least two. No more are needed, but two evidently is the pattern which unites the system of soviets as a whole. [voices shout "That's right"]

[Gorbachev] Good. Please, Andrey Dmitriyevich, your question.

[Sakharov] Yes, my first comment is this: Extraordinarily important things are being discussed here, and it seems to me that this discussion needed a view of the commission, prepared earlier, on this document. We should regard the present discussion as purely provisional until the commissions have fully elaborated this whole draft, and have worked out their own view. In particular this view should be...this view should take account of the drafts compiled in different regions, including Moscow, by groupings, associations of voters. This seems to me to be very important.

Now I have a few specific questions. First: There is a point here that expenditure relating to the preparations for and the holding of elections of people's deputies is borne by the state. Does this exclude initiative groups from taking part in the election campaign of the electors—in a material way even? This would prevent initiative groups and that kind of work would be extremely undemocratic. This would really create a very difficult situation for a great many deputies.

[Gorbachev] Andrey Dmitriyevich, surely an answer has already been given to this question. If you have an objection, please you will take the floor, you will probably register.

[Lukyanov] These initiatives...

[Sakharov interrupting] Yes, my second question is this, I wanted to repeat it more clearly. According to our legislation, an isolation cell for those under investigation is not a place of imprisonment, and so I would like—in so far as people who find themselves in an isolation cell under investigation have not been convicted by the court, and therefore, consistutionally, cannot be deprived of any rights whatever—to elect and be elected it seems to me that including such a fundamental amendment would be a very substantial one. I ask you to answer this again: Has this been taken into account? Do you understand an isolation cell for those under investigation to be not a place of deprivation and imprisonment but rather a place where one is detained in custody not confined in the sense of being deprived of ones rights?

[Lukyanov] We have not changed this article, it is not being changed and it is given in unaltered form, as it has been in the constitution. A person in custody, by virtue of certain circumstances, cannot express his view freely as a voter and, naturally, very serious doubts arise as to whether he can be nominated. This is the reason why the constitution has already established this principle. We do not propose to change it.

[Sakharov] What is this [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] Andrey Dmitriyevich, what other question did you have? Andrey Dmitriyevich, do you have another question?

[Sakharov] Generally speaking I understand you.

[Lukyanov] As far as expenses are concerned, again I have already replied to this question and I would like to say that this is a very tough issue because either we are to allow our candidate deputies to be in an unequal position, or we are to ensure them an equal position at the state's expense. There is no other way out.

[Gorbachev] To make a brief comment: I think the most important thing is that our deputies need to be protected from getting themselves into a situation in which they might begin to be manipulated.

[Lukyanov] I do not want to cite a lot of examples here. Unfortunately there were such examples during the election campaign.

[Gorbachev] Andrey Dmitriyevich, do you have any further questions?

[Sakharov] No.

[Gorbachev] No. Go ahead, please.

[Zhuravlev) Deputy Zhuravlev. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, before putting my question to you, I would like to remind you of one of the questions put to you on 17 October and of your reply. Deputy Salukvadze asked you the following question, I am reading from the stenographic account: I have a simple question, who can answer it? What is a Union Republic? Much depends on the reply to this question. The chairman—you were the chairman—replied: A sovereign state which forms part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I would like to continue the thought expressed here by Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov to the effect that we are discussing extremely complex matters. Their complexity lies also in the fact that they are, apparently, very simple. So, the fact of the matter is that a union of states, in my view, is no longer a state, just as an association of workshops is no longer a workshop and an association of factories is no longer a factory. So, despite all the apparent straightforwardness of the question being put here, they are far from simple. I would also like to ask you a far from simple question. We are retaining Article 95: the Union republics' right to elect from the public organizations. However, the point is that if it is only, say, four rather than all the republics which have this right, then there will be deputies not from the CPSU, but from the four Communist Parties of four Union repubilcs. Aren't we creating another contradiction for all this apparent simplicity? My question lies in the following: Should we not leave the separate parts of the constitution alone since, when we do amend the parts, we make it all the more contradictory, and there are so many contradictions in it without that, that they're coming down on us like snow balls. So should we not stop? That's my question.

[Lukyanov] I do not see any contradiction in the fact that the USSR is a union state and each republic is a sovereign state which is part of the USSR. It is not a union of states but a union state that is made up of states. As deputy [name indistinct] was told.

[Zhuravlev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, let me carry on...

[Gorbachev] Just one minute.

[Lukyanov] As for the Communist Party and other organizatigons, in the event that the republics do elect from public organizations it will be a matter of election from the communists or from trade union members or those of the youth organizations operating in a given republic. This, then, does not create a confederation or a federation of parties.

[Zhuravlev] So you see no contradiction here?

[Lukyanov] That's right.

[Zhuralev] Thank you.

[Gorabchev] Fine. Your question, please.

[Ismailov] Deputy Ismailov. Anatoliy Ivanovich, I should like to clarify a question that has not been correctly formulated here. To start with, we fortunately do not know of a single union republic...

[Gorbachev interrupting] Is this a speech or a question?

[Ismailov] It's a question, definitely a question.

[Gorbachev] Fine, in that case please be brief.

[Ismailov]....that would like to leave our federation, fortunately. However, the USSR Constitution that is in force does provide for such a possibility, that a union republic has the right to leave the USSR. Are union republic acts aimed at this and confirming this really a contradiction to the union constitution? I think that deputies should formulate their questions properly and in giving an explanation, I should very much like you to reaffirm that there are no contradictions here.

[Lukyanov] The republics have retained the right of secession. It is another matter that the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan has tried to decide how it will be implemented. As for what is written in the constitution, for example, the Constitutional Law, that the republics have the right to eliminate, for example, specific divisions in their [words indistinct]...let me explain...in their territory, that is in fact incorrect with regard to the union law, that's to say, the constitution. Because, for example, if any autonomous subdivision of the republic wants to be excluded or changed in the territory of a republic—an autonomous formation—it must be confirmed by the union constitution, because they are enumerated in the union constitution.

[Ismailov] But obviously today's talk is not about that. This is something else.

[Gorbachev] That's all.

[Lukyanov] Of course, of course, I am being asked questions...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Anatoliy Ivanovich, that's all. Your question please.

[Tsyplayev] A question from Deputy Tsyplayev, Komsomol, Leningrad. Anatoliy Ivanovich, don't you think that Articles 137 and 138 on the one hand, and Article 139 are somewhat unbalanced. This is what I mean. Article 137 describes the owers of one higher body of state power, and gives the constitution of the republic the power to describe its authority. Article 139 stipulates the existence of another higher body of state power and describes its power. That's to say, it turns out that the powers of one body are described in the union constitution—and this is the executive authority—and the owers of the other body are stipulated in the republican constitutions—this is the legislative authority. In this case, either we need to describe in this vein the powers of both bodies in the union constitution, or else, if we have started restructuring such that it should be described in the republic constitutions, then the powers of the government should also be given to the republican constitutions to define.

[Lukyanov] From a purely legal point of view, the question is quite correct. However, from the political point of view, the fact is, that when the Supreme Soviets of the republics are being created, only without a congress, they will have other powers, because the congress is a body of authority, and the Supreme Soviet is a body of legislative and organizational control, when there are two of them. And when there is one, then the powers of the congress and the Supreme Soviet come together as if in a single body. This is why we have acted carefuly here in determining what is in their competence.

As for the relation between bodies of authority and bodies of administration, it is clear: it is stipulated here very briefly.

[Tsyplayev] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Good. I was thinking, let us give the floor to those comrades who are at the microphones and end the questions with that. I have twice already, so to speak, increased the time we usually allocate, in view of the importance of this matter, but evidently we do need to conclude this, is that all right, comrades? Then we will begin the exchange of views. Please, go ahead.

[Vulfson] Vulfson, from Latvia. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, I have three brief questions. Are you, and the majority of the Presidium not disturbed by the view which you set forth to the effect that in certain republics, Latvia in particular, the institution of president is opposed by the more radical and nationalist circles, who believe that the election of a president will be an act legitimizing Soviet power in Lativa? That is the first question. Second, do you not think that a president, if he is elected in such a multinational republic as Latvia, will obviously be a most authoritative politician who enjoys the trust of the absolute majority of this multinational republic, the trust of the population, and that precisely he, better than anyone else, will be able to promote the kind of consolidation that I do not expect from the new Supreme Soviet or parliament, because we can expect a polarization of forces and frequent deadlocks there?

And my final question: Does the Supreme Soviet Presidium have the right to ignore the historical traditions that have come about in the Baltic republics? In my view, you were right when you said that we must avoid a concentration of power, but if...[changes thought] and I am in complete agreement with you...[changes thought] but we again must avoid that unitarianism which has caused so much harm to our federation. Thank you.

[Lukyanov] I have spoken in detail about the post of president as, say, a body. If there is a president, then his powers have to be very precisely defined. I understand all the complexities in society and I understand that such a person would have to concentrate the authority of power, and so on. But then the authority of the whole representative body would be all the smaller. Why can this official not be the top representative of precisely this body and elected by this body? This is a very big question. So I think that if we introduce the institution of president, we shall thereby be changing the very structure of authority. And no one is thinking of ignoring the historical tradition, of course, including that of the Baltic. Only one republic has so far come up with this proposal, it is still discussing it, and obviously will go on discusing. I won't hide from you, and there were articles on this in our press, on the possible extension of the rights, let's say, as you are proposing, of heads simply of soviets. These are also other possible things. Everything may depend on events, and so on. But I still think that an extreme concentration of power in one person's hands is counterindicated by Soviet power.

[Kolotov] Deputy Kolotov, Vyborg town, Constituency 61. Anatoliy Ivanovich, I have two brief questions. Article 89 says: The Congress of People's Deputies elects the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Did the Presidium discuss the continuation of this provision on a basis of choice?

[Lukyanov] Of course this is the right of the Supreme Soviet, as...

[Unidentified speaker interrupting] [words indistinct]

[Kolotov] I am simply asking, was it discussed or not?

[Lukyanov] Yes it was. You know, in practice we don't now have elections in any bodies—party, trade union, or soviet—without a choice of candidates...

[Kolotov, interrupting] But we know...

[Lukyanov, continuing] ...including the Central Committee of the Communist parties of the repubilcs. There is nothing terrible in this.

[Kolotov] But we know lots of them without a choice.

[Lukyanov] Good. Your second question.

[Kolotov] My second question. Here, Article 100, it says elections are ensured by electoral commissions which are formed. And then as written. Formed by whom?

[Lukyanov] This procedure is completely envisaged in the laws on elections. Completely. In this case, by the Supreme Soviets of the Republics, which will form these central electoral ... [changes thought] that's to say, the republic electoral commissions.

[Gorbachev] Is that all your questions? Your questions, please.

[Unidentified deputy] Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, everyone knows that in all countries one person has one vote. In our country it is a little bit different. Don't you think that we should... [changes thought] in Article 97 we have: The elector in each constituency has one vote. The words "in each constituency" seem to me to be superfluous here. The elector has one vote, and that's all.

[Lukyanov] No, I don't think so, because from the autonomous republic or union republic, in which you vote, you elect to the Supreme Soviet and to the congress, at least two: One from the territorial, and one from the national territorial constituency. In an autonomous okrug people have three votes, because they elect three candidates. In this particular constituency he is just one, but on the whole this is a complex question. But on the whole he has the possibility of voting once for three candidates. The system is complex, comrades, but that is how it is. Our country is a state of many nationalities.

[Unidentified deputy] And my second question. Anatoliy Ivanovich, do you think that we could add here to Article 100: any number of candidates may be included on the voting list, but no less than two?

[Lukyanov] I have explained this. If we write no less than two than we will be eliminating multimandate constituencies. [Unidentified deputy] But if we leave one candidate then this will simply be a vote and not an election.

[Lukyanov] It is the expression of the will of the voters even if there is only one candidate.

[Unidentified deputy] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Thank you Anatoliy Ivanovich. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Deputy Suleymanov will have the floor for 2 minutes, to say something, please.

[Suleymenov] We say that we have two or even three diplomatic forces. They include the traditional governmental diplomacy, now people's diplomacy is growing stronger, and parliamentary diplomacy is coming into its own. The first document of parliamentary diplomacy was read 3 months ago. It was the Supreme Soviet's address to the U.S. Congress with a proposal to discuss possibilities of a mutual moratorium on underground tests. We have received no answer so far. What is the fate of this document? Where has it got bogged down—here, in the depths of our, so to speak...

[Lukyanov, interrupting] Could you repeat, please?

[Suleymenov] The Supreme Soviet's address to the U.S. Congress proposing a mutual moratorium on underground tests. So, there has been no answer to this so far.

The second point is about people's diplomacy. Today I returned from Karaganda. Yesterday, Sunday, and the day before yesterday rallies were held in Kazakhstan's cities. About 100,000 people gathered in city squares. What caused their indignation? No economic problems can bring our long-suffering and all-enduring people out on to the streets; only resentment and lack of undertanding for them can.

At the beginning of the last session Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov was asked: How is the future of nuclear testing grounds perceived in the light of our new defense doctrine, the principle of reasonable sufficiency? The answer was that we want to reduce the number of explosions at nuclear testing grounds as the first step, and the yield of explosion. Yes, on 8 July there was an explosion with a force of 20 kilotons. Two months later, in September, there was an explosion with a force of about 20 kilotons, too. Then, a month later, on 4 October, 60 kilotons. Then 2 weeks later, on 19 October, the officially announced force was 75 kilotons, whereas in reality many believe and with good reason that the yield was considerably higher, up to 150 kilotons or even more, because there was an earthquake of force 4-5 [scale not specified] in Karaganda itself. Karaganda is 350 km away from the testing ground. The testing ground is situated between four oblasts of Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation. Therefore, the fate of the testing ground is on our mind, of course.

Speaking about all these factors of people's diplomacy, government diplomacy, and parliamentary diplomacy, one would like to refrain from reducing everything only to the government, to one single force alone, and to draw one's attention to the need to keep one's word to the people. When a government does not keep its word, it causes indignation. Yesterday the miners of Karaganda again adopted a decision to the effect that if another explosion is carried out—in other words, the tenor of conversation is becoming different, the tenor of conversation of people's diplomacy with the government—if another explosion is carried out, then they will have to adopt some emergency measures.

This is the information I wanted to present to you.

[Lukyanov] I think, comrades, that we will take this information into account and convey the text of your statement to the government, the Foreign Ministry, the Committee for International Affairs, and to that for defense. Any objections?

[Unidentified voices] No. [passage omitted]

## Moscow TV Carries 24 Oct Supreme Soviet Session

### 1600 GMT

*LD2410180189*

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 24 October begins carrying a recorded program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by A.I. Lukyanov.

At 1600 GMT Lukyanov opens the 24 October session. He says that commissions have been discussing the Constitution and that the deputies have received the documents of the discussions. He calls on the deputies to register; 408 are present, which is a quorum. Lukyanov announced that the amendments to the constitution will be discussed first.

At 1603 GMT Lukyanov introduces Kalmaykov of the Committee of Questions of Legislation. Kalmykov tells of the committee's work in discussing submitted proposals. Kalmykov reads out a proposed alteration to the wording of article 89.

At 1607 GMT Lukyanov asks what procedure the deputies want: discussion or voting? He puts this to the vote: 340 for; 36 against; 17 abstentions, in favor of voting on the article.

At 1609 GMT Burlatskiy raises an objection to the article; he asks whether a congress of soviets is necessary everywhere.

At 1610 GMT Lukyanov says that this objection is unnecessary.

At 1611 GMT Kalmykov says that the question of whether a congress is needed will be decided in the various republics. An unidentified deputy expresses an opinion on article 145, as it affects the article in question.

At 1614 GMT Yeltsin expresses the opinion of the Inter-regional Group on direct elections. Two deputies then give brief opinions.

Lukyanov then calls for a single system for the whole union. He presents the committee's proposal on congresses to the vote: 336 for; 30 against; 17 abstentions. Republics can decide whether to have congresses. A committee proposes listing the levels of organizations that are affected by this article.

At 1620 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks. His words are indistinct.

At 1621 GMT Lukyanov calls for a vote.

At 1623 GMT a deputy objects to repetitions in the constituency. Lukyanov reads out the proposed working and Smirnov's alternate wording. He puts it to the vote. On the committee's proposal: 334 for; 34 against; 16 abstained. Lukyanov says that some people have not voted, or else they are not pressing the buttons correctly.

At 1626 GMT Almykov talks about article 90. It is put to the vote in its new wording, which is not read out: 377 for; 3 against; 7 abstained.

At 1628 GMT Article 91 is put forward by Kalmykov. It concerns presidiums of soviets and whether there should be direct elections of chairmen. This is to be decided in the republics and locally.

At 1631 GMT Burlatskiy puts forth a point, to which Lukyanov responds. Burlatskiy accepts the response and withdraws his objection.

At 1634 GMT a deputy from constituency 479 says that the structure of power should be defined more precisely.

At 1635 GMT (?Avadze) says that republics should decide. Lukyanov says that they have this right.

At 1638 GMT Vorotnikov says that it is a question of the principle of the power structure: presidential or collegiate power.

At 1640 GMT a deputy discusses the difference between the original version and the new one. Then Deputy Stankevich says that presidential power or collegiate is not in question here, but rather the right of the voters.

At 1642 GMT a deputy puts forth a procedural issue to speed up the voting which Lukyanov supports. There are objections from the floor. Lukyanov proposes no discussion on issues on which the commission has been unanimous. At 1645 GMT a deputy asks a constitutional question about soviets' rights as opposed to chairmen's rights.

At 1646 GMT Pilnikov asks how regions can experiment with different systems. Lukyanov explains the possible procedure. Lukyanov quotes Gorbachev on presidential-type power.

At 1648 GMT Kalmykov tells of the wishes expressed by the voters. A deputy then says that these articles should be voted on with deputies revealing their names on how they vote.

At 1650 GMT Zelinskiy expresses an opinion on voting by name. Lukyanov asks the opinion of deputies: 225 for; 128 against; 27 abstained. So voting is to be by normal procedure, not by name.

At 1652 GMT a Chelyabinsk deputy asks that the way deputies vote should be told to the electors. Lukyanov says that this has already been rejected. Another deputy asks for voting by name.

At 1654 GMT A deputy asks for the whole text of the article to be read out. Lukyanov says they will have the text in their hands in 20 minutes.

At 1655 GMT Kalmykov reads out article 91 in full. A deputy then says that the reading is not clear. He refers to Gorbachev's opinion on presidential power and says independently elected chairmen would also be wrong. Power would belong to the soviets which should elect their chairmen.

At 1659 GMT Lukyanov says that the commission reached a consensus. A deputy then proposes a minor change to the working.

At 1701 GMT Deputy Veyser says that the meaning cannot be grasped without the text and calls for an interval until the text is ready. Another deputy gives a different interpretation of Gorbachev's speech

At 1702 GMT Lukyanov puts the committee's proposal to the vote: 281 for; 40 against; 43 abstained.

AT 1703 GMT Lukyanov announces a 15-minute interval until the text is ready.

### 1720 GMT

*LD2410192989*

[Editorial report] Following the announced 15-minute interval; Moscow television service in Russian at 1720 GMT on 24 October resumes carrying a recorded program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1720 GMT Lukyanov calls for registration; 395 are present. He says that article 91 has been approved and article 95 is now to be discussed. Kalmykov says this one was very contentious. The second section was largely opposed, but after consideration it was left in; it gives republics rights to affect alterations. This article concerns the election of deputies from public organizations if the individual republics desire it.

At 1724 GMT Kalmykov sums up the opinions of the committees.

At 1725 GMT Lukyanov raises the issue of the deputies already elected from public bodies. Then Deputy Druz offers an alternative wording in favor of deputies from public bodies.

At 1727 GMT Kalmykov says that the new law would not be retroactive.

At 1728 GMT a deputy calls for voting by name on this issue. She says that human rights commitments make voting from public bodies wrong. Lukyanov rejects this from a judicial point of view. Lukyanov reads out the views of some members of the Committee on Questions of Legislation. A deputy opposes deputies being elected from public bodies and urges that voting here should be by name.

At 1733 GMT Deputy (Zolotukhin) says that election by public bodies is unnecessary. The following exchange then takes place: "[Deputy (Tsepovaleko)] Regarding the last phrase or paragraph in the commission's conclusion, I would like to say that the introduction of any kind of changes at the present would put legality in doubt. And this simply frightens some. Dear comrades, I sympathize with the deputy who spoke now. There are many names among the deputies from public organizations...

"[Lukyanov; interrupting] "Please present your proposal."

"[(Tsepovalenko)] "I will put forwad my proposal now. [continuing previously unfinished sentence]... there are many names, many worthy names known to the whole country, and we would vote for them with pleasure. It is not necessary to intimidate anyone. Nobody wants to acknowlede that they are, say, second class deputies. But, dear comrades, I call on you, all deputies of the Supreme Soviet, not to permit such discrimination. After all, our electorate needs all people! Let's vote against this trick of the apparatchiks; because among those who are worthy, there is a lot of ballast. We can, indeed, see them. And it is impermissible, in the future, in the USSR constitution that..."

"[Lukyanov; interrupting] "I wish to take the floor away from you, because you called part of the deputies ballast. That's enough. [noise in audience] Comrades, let's abstain from this kind of expression. [turning to (Tsepovalenko)] Please excuse me, but I will not give you the floor again."

At 1737 GMT a deputy expresses support for the previous speaker. Deputy Yezhelev opposes public bodies' deputies.

At 1738 GMT a deputy calls for procedures to speed up the voting at this session.

Deputy Krayko expresses his opinion on the question: Republics should choose for themselves.

At 1740 GMT Naumov supports public bodies' deputies.

At 1741 GMT Deputy (?Bykov) calls for another party to have the same rights as the Communist Party. He says "I am an impassioned opponent of elections from public organizations, and I would support the voting by name with publication in the press. But if, God forbid, the supporters of elections from public organizations win, then I wish to report that here, at this parliament, a social democratic fraction is completing its formation and it demands its rights just as the Communist Party does. Thank you."

At 1742 GMT, Deputy Bisher says that republics should have the right to decide the question. Bisher goes on to say that if public bodies deputies are rejected for the future, there should be new elections immediately.

At 1744 GMT Kirilov says that the Soviet people are politically mature enough to elect their own deputies. A deputy then calls for a new system of electing deputies from public bodies. Another deputy says that his electors have asked him to insist on voting on this issue by name.

At 1746 GMT Primakov says he opposes diktat telling the republics how to organize elections and that they should be given the right to choose.

At 1748 GMT Stankevich says that other countries have corporate candidates; here, however, the bodies are allocated numbers of deputies arbitrarily.

At 1750 GMT a Ukrainian deputy calls for republican referendums on the issue.

At 1752 GMT Deputy Borodin expresses support for the retention of the system to harness all forces in support of perestroyka.

## 1754 GMT

*LD2410221689*

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1754 GMT on 24 October continues carrying a recorded program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1754 GMT Andrey Sakharov begins speaking and the following exchange occurs: "[Sakharov] I wish to support all the speakers who are against elections from public organizations; although I myself have been elected from a public organization. I think that if the congress introduces the B—as they say here—and if it puts in doubt the people elected from public organizations, then 750 posts will simultaneously become vacant for by-elections and we should simply be prepared to undergo this test once again. In my view this would be just. But I think that the congress will not decide to do this. I saved a bit of time, and I would like to ask the chairman to permit me to speak about other articles. [voices in background] [Sakharov continues] I was forced to... [changes thought] Alright then...

"[Lukyanov] I ask you to pass it to me, I am ready to read out your proposal, but let's finish this article.

"[Sakharov] "I will submit it to the commission."

"[Lukyanov] "The only thing I wish to say is that Andrey Dmitriyevich's speech says that the question of retrospective power of the law is not an empty question. You can see how the question is being put. [turning to audience] This is how I understand it."

At 1756 GMT Lapshov says his electors strongly oppose the pesent system as paradoxical. Another deputy then expresses his opinion; others also speak on the issue.

At 1802 GMT Burlatskiy says that the situation has changed since the last elections, with the appearance of unofficial public organizations that also want their own deputies, which would give rise to contention which should be avoided in the republics.

At 1805 GMT a deputy says that some of the most democratic elections were in the public bodies and they produced some of the most active fighters for perestroyka.

At 1807 GMT Obolenskiy says all his electors oppose the present system; opinion polls indicate the same. Referendums should be held on the issue.

At 1809 GMT Roy Medvedev says the opposition is to deputies' being elected by the top echelons of the public bodies.

At 1812 GMT a deputy says the issue should not be decided from above. Current bodies will decide the situation again in their own image in the republics.

At 1814 GMT a deputy says that the issue is urgent for the republics.

At 1816 GMT Lukyanov presents a compromise proposal to the session. There are objections from the hall. Lukyanov says that if the system is rejected it will entail changes in other articles of the Constitution.

At 1819 GMT a deputy opposes the current system. He questions the role of the chairman here. Lukyanov speaks about the role of the chairman

At 1824 GMT a deputy says that only union questions should be decided here. Another deputy says that it is unethical to question the rights of a section of the deputies. Their rights should be reasserted; but the system should be changed.

At 1829 GMT Lukyanov proposes ending the debate and puts this to the vote: 321 for; 35 against; 10 abstained. Lukyanov then asks if the voting is to be by name: 313 for; 35 against; 19 abstained. It is to be by name.

At 1832 GMT Lukyanov presents the motion that part of the USSR deputies can be elected from public bodies. A deputy proposes the removal of the words: can be. Lukyanov agrees; it is to read: is elected. Lukyanov puts it to the vote. A deputy then asks why the proposal to remove the section altogether has not been voted on. Another deputy wants to restore the words: can be. Lukyanov says this is unconstitutional.

At 1836 GMT Lukyanov calls for registration; 404 are present.

At 1837 GMT a deputy questions the wording.

At 1838 GMT Ryzhov tells of his committee's procedure on reaching the wording and proposes a sequence of voting.

At 1839 GMT Lukyanov puts to the vote the part on peoples deputies' being elected by public organizations. Lukyanov calms an interrupter. The second proposal is to remove the section altogether: 126 for; 236 against; 27 abstained. There is some confusion in hall. There is a proposal to exclude the section altogether, which is put to the vote: 254 for; 85 against; 36 abstained. There is a proposal to vote by chambers. Lukyanov then moves on to article 96.

At 1844 GMT Kalmykov introduces the article on who is ineligible to vote. Lukyanov puts it to the vote.

At 1846 GMT a deputy says that rendering accused people ineligible is wrong. The matter is discussed. A legal expert presents his point of view.

At 1851 GMT Lukyanov reads out the whole section. There are other questions from the floor. Lukyanov then asks for votes to be cast.

At 1855 GMT a Leningrad deputy asks a question, and Lukyanov asks for voting on the end of discussion on the question: 336 for; 23 against; 7 abstentions. Lukyanov asks for voting on the article with the amendment deputies have before them. It seems that the machine isn't working; deputies seem amused.

At 1857 GMT Kalmykov goes on to article 100 and reads it out. The voting machine still is not working; a 15-minute break is announced.

There is a brief break.

At 1859 GMT transmission of the broadcast is resumed. Deputy Romanenko takes the floor. He raises various procedural and other points relating to the discussion so far. He says he voted against the participation of public organizations.

At 1902 GMT (?Vorobyev) takes the floor. He says he is worried that sometimes comrades speak just to make the resolution of matters difficult. He says: let's have a constructive aim before us to find the optimal solutions.

At 1904 GMT a deputy complains of the slow pace of adopting the laws at the Supreme Soviet so far. He says his voters are asking how long the talking will go on there. He says: we need more voting and less talking.

## 1906 GMT

*LD2410223989*

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1906 GMT on 24 October continues carrying a recorded program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1906 GMT a deputy takes the floor and acknowledges the slow pace of affairs and warns that they will not be able to get all things done if they continue at such a pace.

At 1907 GMT Lukyanov says they should entrust more to the committees and commissions, because if they make decisions there mistakes will arise. He speaks of the unnecessary emotions at the session and asks the deputies to register for voting; there are 389 in all. Lukyanov notes that some have already left. He reads part five of article 296 on restrictions on voting for certain categories: 340 for; 22 against; 20 abstentions. He then reads the amendment which has been adopted for article 100 concerning the expenditure connected with carrying out elections.

At 1911 GMT, regarding part five of article 100, Yeltsin asks about electoral commissions in okrugs. Lukyanov agrees that the wording should be changed.

At 1913 GMT a deputy presents a point about personal savings for this. Part five of article 100 is then voted on, with the amended wording: 368 for; 8 against; 7 abstentions; thus it is adopted.

At 1915 GMT a deputy objects to certain points of the document and presents his own version; he says he disagrees with Lukyanov.

At 1917 GMT Lukyanov presents the question of reopening the discussion of the article for a vote.

At 1918 GMT Deputy Kalmykov takes the floor and speaks on other parts of article 100, namely he reads out section three, proposed by Sakharov, regarding the number of candidates to be put forward for one place.

At 1919 GMT Lukyanov speaks of the various formulations of the section regarding the number of candidates who can be included in the voting paper. At 1921 GMT Deputy Bisher asks about the number of candidates. Lukyanov replies to the question.

At 1923 GMT Reshetnikov tells of his committee's discussion of the issue. Then deputy Kim asks a question, to which Lukyanov replies.

At 1925 GMT a deputy calls for the principle of alternate candidates to be really ensured.

At 1927 GMT Lukyanov puts the question of the number of candidates to the vote. For "any number of candidates" 296; against 57; 21 abstained.

At 1929 GMT other minor amendments are proposed. Kalmykov replies to them.

At 1934 GMT Lukyanov puts the article to the vote: 351 for; 13 against; 11 abstained.

At 1935 GMT Kalmykov introduces article 101 and the proposed amendment. It is put to the vote: 356 for; 0 against; 6 abstained.

At 1937 GMT some deputies ask minor questions about the text.

At 1940 GMT Kalmykov introduces the next article: 139. There are some minor remarks from the floor. Lukyanov replies. Lukyanov then puts the law with its amendments to the vote: 361 for; 4 against; 5 abstained.

At 1947 GMT Bichkauskas calls for republican constitutions to be written in the capitals.

At 1948 GMT deputy Nikolaychuk calls for republics to be given the right to allow their deputies to be released from work. Lukyanov puts it to the vote: 62 for; 279 against; 22 abstained.

At 1951 GMT Lukyanov introduces the decision.

At 1953 GMT Boldyrev points out an inconsistency in the text. Lukyanov then puts it to the vote: 342 for; 14 against; 14 abstained.

At 1955 GMT Lukyanov replies to Boldyrev's criticism.

At 1956 GMT a deputy makes a minor suggestion.

At 1958 GMT Primakov asks how the deputies felt about voting procedures. He has taken over as chairman. He proposed Sitoryan as deputy chairman of the Council of Minsters. This is voted on: 271 for; 62 against; 35 abstained. There is applause.

At 2002 GMT Fedorov speaks about Lenin's law on press freedom and its present sucessor. He calls for proposals to improve the present draft law.

The recorded program concludes at 2004 GMT.

## Comments at 24 Oct Supreme Soviet

### Yeltsin on Elections

*LD2410214389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1614 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Comments by Boris N. Yeltsin, people's deputy, at the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I subscribe to the proposal of Comrade Burlatskiy on the first part. I would like to speak of the second part. Nevertheless, I also insist upon the proposal of our committee, including the interregional group of people's deputies, that the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet be elected by direct elections, while the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republics and of local soviets should be decided on in accordance with the laws in the republics.

### Vorotnikov on Power Structure

*LD2410205889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1638 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Comments by V.I. Vorotnikov, Politburo member, from the program on the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 October at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Well, I think that we should not conceal the essence of the question, in which there was very fundamental discussion yesterday behind that formulation, which is rather vague in my view.

I do not know—maybe I'm wrong here—but in this case, it is a question not just of elections. It is a question of the principle of power. If we now give such a formulation, that means that we are giving the right to construct bodies of Soviet power, to a certain extent, according to different principles in different government formations, in different union republics, in different autonomous republics, and so forth. Won't that lead to what Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke of yesterday, that that form then essentially will be a presidential form of government, and the collegiate and soviet system of government will be eliminated in our country? That is why on the one hand there is such competence in the republic, and on the other, we should have a system.

We have discussed here administrative subsections, which ought to exist within the framework of the soviets and that gave rise to fundamental discussions here. But in this case, I do not know. I think that such a form is, on the whole, going to [words indistinct] (?stand our system of soviets on its head).

## Supreme Soviet Approves Amendments on Elections

*LD2410182289 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] At a joint sitting of its two houses today, the Soviet parliament approved amendments to the national constitution related to the electoral system.

The draft law is yet to be adopted by the 2nd Congress of People's Deputies, but it can be used as a basis for changing republican legislation on elections in the spirit of perestroika already today.

Elections to republican and local governing bodies will take place between December 1989 and March 1990.

Amendments to the nation's fundamental law were vigorously discussed at parliamentary committees and commissions following a report by First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov on Monday.

They were then examined at the parliament's plenary sitting today.

The new act substantially expands the sovereignty of republics in the legislative regulation of the electoral system.

The procedure for electing presidents of soviets, or councils, will be determined by the constitutions of Union and autonomous republics and may be different in various republics.

The issue generated keen debate, similar to the discussion on Monday.

Several deputies opposed the formula allowing for the possibility of a direct popular election of the first person in republican and local soviets. In their opinion, this would violate the principle envisaging that all power in the country belongs to soviets.

By the majority of votes, however, the Supreme Soviet approved this very wording.

Stormy debate was caused by the issue concerning elections from public organisations. It was initially planned to apply the principle of shaping the corps of people's deputies of the USSR (two thirds elected by the population, and one third by public organisations) to elections to republican and local soviets.

Many deputies, however, while recognising that public organisations should have the full right to nominate candidates, came out in favour of conducting elections only in constituencies.

The failure to meet this approach, in their opinion, would violate the principle of universal equal and direct suffrage. As a result, the Soviet parliament decided after a roll-call vote to delete the provision on the election of a part of deputies from public organisations.

Towards the end of the sitting, the Supreme Soviet confirmed Stepan Sitaryan, 59, in the post of deputy prime minister and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission.

In the past three years Sitaryan worked as first deputy chairman of the State Planning Committee (Gosplan) of the USSR.

The next joint sitting of the Soviet parliament's two houses will be held next Monday, October 30.

## Defense Committee Debates Border Security

*PM2310124589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by S. Karkhanin under the rubric: "Kremlin Debates. From the Sitting of a Committee of Deputies": "Line of Tranquillity"]

[Text] These people had prepared themselves thoroughly. They learned to swim underwater and equipped themselves with hard currency and weapons. When they considered that they had provided for every eventuality, they set out. But the route lay from Peshawar across the Soviet Union's southern border... The attempt to break through the border proved unsuccessful: The vigilance of the border detail foiled it. The intruders were arrested; an investigation is under way.

Is this the subject of a thriller? No, it is an episode from real life. It was mentioned at the Friday sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for Defense and State Security Questions which discussed the work of the country's border troops.

The USSR Law on the USSR State Border is a slim booklet. It has never been secret and contains the answers to many questions that arise in connection with the service of the men in green-peaked caps. The first article of the document reads as follows: "The USSR state border is the line and the vertical plane along this line that defines the limits of the USSR's territory—on land, on water, underground, and in the air."

Point of Information: Our state borders are 62,000-km long, of which almost 40,000 km are maritime borders. Approximately 200,000 men are currently serving in the border troops.

We often think that their task is merely to arrest intruders. But here is a figure: Every year Soviet border commissariat and border representative services conduct approximately 1,500 talks with colleagues from adjacent states, settling various problems and conflicts. Or take the following fact: It was the border guards at Brest who recorded the first radiation "fallout" from the accident at Chernobyl on their instruments. On the whole, guarding the country's borders, as Army General V.A. Matrosov, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB, said, involves a whole series of political, economic, military, and other measures.

The dialogue between the leaders of the border troops and people's deputies at the committee sitting highlighted the changes that are taking place at the border in connection with present-day realities. The tactics for the armed defense of the border are being revised in view of our new defensive doctrine. The barbed wire entanglements, which for a long time were virtually the symbol of our territory's inassailability, are disappearing from the border control zones: The time for "fences" is past.

The popular thesis that the "borders are dying" sounds impressive, but as yet in fact is poorly substantiated. It is no accident that since the war the length of border under guard has risen by almost 50 percent. It is too early for the soldiers in green service caps to hang up their assault rifles: You cannot describe as reassuring the number of people who want to illegally cross the border by force or by guile even at the price of bloodshed.

Point of information. Last year and this year 3,400 people have been arrested for violating the USSR State Border. Almost half of them are people trying to plunder our country's natural resources. Some 9,000 of the attempts to violate the border were recorded in the Southern Kuriles.

These statistics need to be interpreted for complete clarity. The situation in the Kuriles is attributable to "strong-arm pressure" from the Japanese, who, as is well known, are making territorial claims on the Soviet Union. Japanese fishing boats uninhibitedly try to infiltrate our waters. Formally speaking, Soviet border ships have the right to suppress these attempts with fire and sword, however, humane considerations prevail: The "lost" fishermen, who incidentally are equipped with special nets that surface only in response to an electronic signal, are merely sent home.

It is typical that 81 percent of the total number of detained violators were traveling not "from our country" but "to our country." Thus the tale of the aforementioned Peshawar gang is by no means the only instance. Some 400 kg of foreign narcotics have been confiscated in the last 18 months in Central Asia. There are poachers and agents of foreign special services. What about people who tried illegally to leave the motherland? Here is a typical case: A man committed a crime in the Soviet Union and, afraid that he would be exposed, tried to cross the border and was arrested. During the investigation the prosecutor asked why he did not choose to leave legally. "Then I wouldn't have been of any interest to anyone over there," the transgressor replied. "I counted on publicity, on a ballyhoo, and therefore on money abroad, in the hope of selling the story of my duel with the border guards at a higher price."

"Of late the situation on the state border has considerably improved," V.L. Lapygin, chairman of the deputies' committee, stressed. "Nonetheless, we have seen for ourselves that our state suffers economic damage due to the people who try to breach the border. We'd better calculate this damage! Then it will be easier to assess the need for expenditure on border troops who protect national assets."

...Relations on the Turkish, Norwegian, and Iranian borders have improved, and the USSR-Chinese border is functioning normally. There are reassuring signs: The line defining the limits of the country, as the law says, may now be described as a "line of tranquillity." The men in green service caps are working hard to ensure that this line is not violated.

V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, comments:

"We have now come to the conclusion that the concept of guarding our border must contain fundamentally new elements and ideas: The situation on the border has changed drastically.

"As is well known, the USSR's territory covers 22 million sq km, of which 3,600 sq km form the border zone. We have drafted proposals in the conviction that there is simply no point in retaining this border zone any longer. It extends up to 600 km in some areas.

"We must also think about ensuring that there are fewer violations of the border. Just imagine: Our borders are violated 2,000 times every year. But if we relax our guard here, this figure will increase many times because people from outside will be able to freely infiltrate the USSR's territory. People do not come to our country merely to admire our way of life and see whether it is good or bad, but to engage in poaching or to commit crimes. We must ponder seriously how—while reducing the border zone—we can ensure complete security around our border by reinforcing our ties and through closer and more businesslike contacts with the local population."

## Kryuchkov Discusses Border Guards

*PM2310123189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3*

[Report by V. Dolganov: "Border Guards Not Asking for Subsidies"]

[Text] During the discussion of the drafts of the plan and budget for 1990 in the committees and commissions of our parliament, it has already become traditional for the department leaders to ask the people's deputies to help "get hold of" some additional appropriations for the sector. The speech delivered by Army General V.A. Matrosov, chief of the USSR KGB Border Troops, at the sitting of the Committee on Defense and State Security Questions was an exception in that sense. He stressed immediately that the border guards understand the complex situation which has taken shape in the country's national economy and are not demanding any additional funds even though in connection with the relaxation of international tension their tasks of guarding the 62,000 km of our borders have become in no way simpler.

Borders do not die, V.A. Matrosov said. Throughout the world the length of the borders which are being guarded has increased nearly 50 percent in postwar years. Opening borders for the many, many people who come to us for peaceful purposes and simplifying the procedure for international exchanges is another matter. The deputies welcomed with satisfaction the report on the normalization of the situation on the Soviet-Chinese border, about how the border troops' leadership itself has elaborated proposals for reducing 10-fold the number of closed border zones, about how the barbed wire is being removed in many border sectors and the procedure for drawing up documents for legally crossing the border is being simplified....

Our country's new peace initiatives have demanded the elaboration of a new defense doctrine which will naturally also affect the border guards' service. But will it become simpler and easier? By no means. In the course of last year and this year, about 3,400 border violators have been apprehended and 19 percent were trying to leave our territory—mainly they were people hiding from legal retribution for crimes. Recently the struggle against arms and narcotics smuggling and against terrorists groupings seeking to penetrate our territory has been stepped up.

The embezzlement of our natural resources in the sea and mountains and in northern regions has become a real scourge. Thus, recently in the Southern Kurile Islands alone Japanese fishing vessels have made about 9,000 attempted incursions across the border. Sometimes there is no modern equipment, particularly electronic equipment, for successfully combating poachers.

And it is now emerging that the daily life of the border guards themselves is no picnic. For instance, about 5,000 officers, ensigns, and warrant officers are in need of apartments. A very large number live at the border posts in squalid conditions. Finding work for the wives and other members of the border guards' families is an incredibly acute problem....

In general, this "sector" has just as many problems as all the others. Nonetheless they are not asking for subsidies from the budget? Why? I think the experience of the border troops could in this case prove useful to the USSR Defense Ministry and many civilian departments. Having halved the number of border districts, the USSR KGB border troops' leadership has cut back on a substantial quantity of the management apparatus, thus releasing considerable funds for its own needs. The border troops are the category of troops where the fewest generals serve. With a view to supplying the needs of servicemen and the members of their families, the development of auxiliary farms attached to border posts is widely practised.

The members of the committee, having assessed the worth of the border guards' desire to renounce additional appropriations and not to create additional tension in the economy, nonetheless approach in a most serious manner the analysis of the economic and social questions and problems which exist in the border troops. Having expressed concern over these troops' lag behind in terms of technical equipment, Deputy L.V. Sharin suggested that the committee hear from representatives of the ministries and departments fulfilling border guards' orders. People's Deputy V.S. Podziruk spoke of the need to improve food supplies for detachments and border posts in particularly remote border "spots" while Deputy V.N. Tuzov suggested measures to develop the social sphere. Those taking part in the discussion supported the proposal from People's Deputy N.N. Engver, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Youth Affairs, that the problems of young people serving on the border should be separated into an individual bloc.

The session was addressed by V.A. Kryuchkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB. He familiarized the people's deputies and the journalists invited to this sitting with the elaboration of a new concept for guarding the border, noting that the realities of life demand that new conditions be provided for millions of people to cross the border in both directions. V.A. Kryuchkov spoke with alarm of how many of our land's resources are now going abroad, leaving the economic zone.

The speaker also touched on the problem of the collaboration between the border guard authorities and the local soviets. Since the USSR KGB submitted proposals for a substantial reduction to the border zones, many local organs of power have started to express dissatisfaction with this decision. This dissatisfaction is understandable: They will now have additional troubles on the territories under their jurisdiction and they do not all want that.

The results of the discussion were summed up by V.P. Lapygin, chairman of a parliamentary committee, who proposed a draft decision on the questions examined.

I want to describe one more event which will probably be of interest to readers. The 82 people's deputies serving in the Army and Navy decided to create a club of deputies from the USSR Armed Forces. The first sitting, with the participation of D.T. Yazov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the country's defense minister, and of workers of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army, was held at the Central House of the Soviet Army. The club's council has been elected to represent all categories of junior, middle-ranking, and top officers and generals, and the club's cochairmen were also elected: USSR People's Deputies E.S. Gams, military unit engineer; and A.V. Tsalko, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR and commander of a military unit.

One of the club's main tasks is to help in the solution of the numerous problems which have accumulated recently.

## Supreme Soviet Interest Groups Viewed

*LD2310183289 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[From the "Inside Report" program presented by Marina Dimova with Dmitriy Volkov and Dmitriy Linnik]

[Excerpts] [Dimova] Next, we turn to some aspects of the nation's first democratically elected legislature, the Congress of People's Deputies and the standing parliament that it elects, the Supreme Soviet. At the first Congress of People's Deputies in early summer two deputies, Dr Yuriy Afanasyev, a historian, and Dr Gavriil Popov, an economist, produced a veritable shock, having divided the deputies into a radical minority that desired to speed up perestroyka and a majority which Afanasyev not very tactfully described as aggressively obedient. The Supreme Soviet elected by that Congress of People's Deputies is currently in its second session. Its work is proceeding far from easily, but is it because of the confrontation between the radical minority and the aggressively obedient majority? We discuss the issue with Dmitriy Volkov and Dmitriy Linnik.

[Linnik] The statements by Afanasyev and Popov resulted in the formation of an organized radical minority group. The Interregional Deputy Group, as it was termed, announced its emergence at the first session of the Supreme Soviet and said it would come up with alternative bills that should speed up the progress of perestroyka. [passage omitted]

[Volkov] First Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov spoke about the presence in parliament of various groups of deputies. They include agrarians, industrialists, and so on. Their priorities are different, and since in the present state of crunch [as heard] our economic problems are also very much a matter of political significance, the division into agrarians and industrialists is also a political matter.

[Linnik] A member of the Coordinating Council of the Inter-Regional Group, Mikhail Bocharov, spoke of another specific group besides his own, that of deputies from the three Soviet Baltic republics. [passage omitted]

[Dimova] Going back to the interest groups in parliament and in the Congress, agrarians, industrialists, ecologists and so on, don't they seem to be oriented too much to the focus of their interests and don't they tend to overlook other matters?

[Linnik] It's true of some of them and with regard to some matters. Obviously it takes experts to get through all the fine points of legislation, for instance, and it takes another kind of expert to formulate or oppose this or that aspect of proposed economic legislative acts. On the other hand, though, the group of ecologists you have mentioned recently came up with an alternative bill on property rights. [passage omitted]

[Dimova] Going back to the distribution of political forces in parliament. Can one say that with the exception of the Inter-Regional Group the delegations of the Baltic republics, the rest of the deputies are politically undecided, or are they totally supportive of the government line? Are they really the obedient majority, in the parlance of Yuriy Afanasyev?

[Linnik] I believe the personal authority and charisma of President Gorbachev is no small factor in shaping the opinion of many deputies. On the other hand, as Mikhail Bocharov says:

[Begin Bocharov recording in Russian fading into English translation] Parliament is still raw, as we call it. Many members of the Supreme Soviet are simply unprepared to seriously approach major problems. Probably it takes time to educate politicians that wouldn't confine themselves to the interests of this or that specific ethnic, professional, or public group. [end recording]

[Dimova] Would you say that the Inter-Regional Group is itself ready for this kind of functioning?

[Volkov] They have been reproached for contributing too little to the work of the Supreme Soviet. Deputy Belozertsev said in part:

[Begin Belozertsev recording in Russian fading into English translation] We haven't yet found a normal pace of work. It is a pity that we haven't formed a real force. I am tolerant of other people's positions, but I believe the Inter-Regional group's economic program is weak. [end recording]

[Linnik] Yes, the Inter-Regional Group is not nearly as effective in parliament as it was expected to be. I mean, some of its members are prominent in the work of parliament, but it isn't very active as a group. It's advanced few alternative bills and the group itself is aware of that. Mikhail Bocharov said:

[Begin Bocharov recording in Russian fading into English translation] We're completing the group's economic platform; we also intend to table our version of the bill on property rights—it's our bill, even though it incorporates a lot of what has already been said at the session. [end recording]

[Linnik] That's Mikhail Bocharov. So when the bill on property rights is published for nationwide discussion they're going to be several versions, that of the parliamentary commission, the Inter-Regional Group, and the ecologists and maybe some others.

[Dimova] The political balance of forces in parliament is clearly not in favor of the Inter-Regional Group, or the ecologists for that matter. Do you think their legislative initiatives have a chance to win major support?

[Volkov] The Inter-Regional Group has slightly over one-eighth of the seats in the Parliament. The ecologists have even fewer. But the thing is that their drafts are to be submitted to a nationwide discussion and the voters are going to make their own choice, irrespective of the parliamentary balance.

[Linnik] Besides, I don't think the correlation of the political forces in Parliament is something very stable. My impression is that it's already been changing. Anatoliy Sobchak, who emerged this year as a spectacular politician, said about it:

[Begin Sobchak recording in Russian fading into English translation] Even in the course of the parliamentary session you can see it get wiser and more progressive. You can see how deputies without any political stance assume one. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Dimova] Now, going back to the existence of various political groups in Parliament, do you think Parliament is hampered or aided by that?

[Volkov] There is still a long-time stereotype in the minds of many people here that any sort of division, any sort of pluralism is a bogey. The stereotype dates back dozens of years and these people maintain that the emergence of factions is bound to lead to greater tensions. But now an increasing number of people take the view that such groups on the contrary are an instrument of overcoming the present critical situation.

[Linnik] Mikhail Bocharov of the Inter-Regional Group said on that score:

[Begin Bocharov recording in Russian fading into English translation] I believe in a couple of years' time such groups are going to be officially registered in Parliament. Through that, I believe, we'll be able to achieve parliamentary standards similar to those in developed countries. [end recording]

[Linnik] That's the view of Mikhail Bocharov. Consolidation is most productive when it's achieved not through persuasion but through reasoning and an understanding of the need for it.

## Political & Social

### Gorbachev Speech to PRAVDA Editors Televised

*LD2410192589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Speech by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the PRAVDA Editorial Office in Moscow on 23 October during a meeting with members of the editorial collegium, section editors, and members of the party committee—recorded]

[Text] I think that in any job, if it is of a creative nature, the more so work that is linked with coverage of real processes taking place in society—and society is currently at such a state —there can be both successes and blunders. What is important is the line, the fundamental position, and in this sense, PRAVDA stands firmly on party positions, and on positions of perestroyka, of support for perestroyka. I think that PRAVDA has, in general, done a huge amount of work to prepare our public opinion, and it has set the tone in this, getting public opinion to understand the idea of perestroyka.

All in all, comrades, what we are putting into perestroyka, this is indeed in its designs a revolutionary cause. A revolution in a revolution, that's how we put it. We want to stress thereby, first of all, that the current perestroyka is a continuation of the idea of the October [Revolution], it is an endorsement and the development, in the new historical conditions, of the choice that we made in 1917, under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik party; and on the other hand, that the depth of the changes today, the renewal of our socialist society, is such that they have to be understood as revolutionary. Indeed, these changes touch on property relations, that is, that which relates to the very base, with the main thrust being to overcome the alienation of man from the means of production, and from the products of his labor, and the main thing, to make him a real dramatis personae in the economy.

Essentially, through radical economic reform, we want to hand over economic power to the working people. This is the first point. The second point is that we want to overcome alienation, that is, to bring to completion and resolve the task that the Bolsheviks and Lenin began, to overcome the alientation of man from power, the working people from power. In this regard we have launched a political reform, and look how this process is developing. There is still something here for all of us to think over. But one thing is clear; it seems to me that we can today place on record that here, too, we have chosen the correct direction—the transfer of power to the soviets, and through this the realization of the idea of popular power. And again, in the political process, through democratization, through the regeneration of the soviets, through a new appraisal of their role in the current situation, we want to bring out man as the main dramatis personae in perestroyka and in society.

So, in this sense, too, these are indeed profound revolutionary changes. So, we have to say that we are facing perhaps the most complex task of the moral and spiritual revival and improvement of society. All these are large-scale changes, and the fact that since April 1985, PRAVDA has actively and in a party-minded way engaged itself in the propagation and explanation of the ideas of perestroyka has had a great importance—a purely political and practical one, but also in that PRAVDA has set the tone, in this sense, for all the media. PRAVDA, like the Central Committee, is at the forefront, and therefore, today strict opinions are being formed about the activity of the Central Committee and the Politburo, and the party as a whole, and of course, strict opinions are being formed on how a party newspaper, or the main party newspaper, let us put it that way, PRAVDA, the organ of the Party Central Committee, is coping with its role and what it is doing, are they not?

Perhaps, Communists and those who work in the Central Committee and in other party bodies, at various levels, sometimes ought to feel certain discomfort in the sense that today people openly and freely form their opinions both about everything that takes place in society and about the positions of party members, and especially about the positions of those party members who carry out responsible functions in the party.

I think you feel this from PRAVDA too. And when you receive letters—some of them reach me, they concern the Central Committee and they concern PRAVDA, too—I think that it is quite understandable and should be regarded as a normal process. We should be free from that—and a gain of the current period, so to speak, I think, a great gain is the fact that a two-way process is under way today; both from the top and from the bottom, there is feedback. I think this is a normal situation which enables us, in policy-making and in practical life, to perceive feelings and processes that are taking place in society and, naturally, to transform them both in policy and, hence, in the activity of the mass information media and the activity of PRAVDA. It seems to me that we are now getting rid of the complex which implies that we have to lecture everybody and to utter words of truth, and, as it were, so to speak, that the political process or the ideological process or the organization of things amounts to this and goes no further.

No! We can see now that for the first time perhaps after many a decade, we are looking at perestroyka, at the renewal of socialism as a natural process of creation by the masses. This is Lenin's idea, Lenin's idea. This is a complex process. I would like to put a few requests, a few appeals to the PRAVDA people on behalf of the Central Committee and on my own behalf—and you know, not only because we have met about this but above all in connection with the stage we are now in, with the stage at which we, the party, party cadres, and the party press, are now operating.

What is behind us, let us say, was a very important stage, without which there would be no continuation today; it was a stage of understanding the society in which we found ourselves in the middle of the 1980's, and the stage of understanding everything that is happening in the world around us. In the long run, this analysis was very important. It was precisely upon the basis of this analysis, I would say a fearless analysis, and a tough analysis, that the policy of perestroyka had its foundation for our society. Nor would there have been the new thinking for the foreign policy that we have proposed to the world without this stage. Therefore, I would not like to belittle that stage. After all one had to understand all this, to comprehend and to understand oneself better, so to speak. I would not say that we reached this understanding overnight. This accounts for many slips and miscalculations which are occurring and have occurred during these years.

Nevertheless, for the most part this analysis has taken us to the policy of perestroyka, the more so considering that we have involved people in the actual process and made it a democratic process. This has also immediately affected the mood in society and aroused a certain reaction and trust in the party. And I must say that at that stage, the party sensed very strongly the support from the working people. And its prestige grew. Nevertheless, this was a time of scientific searches, a time of hope, and I would say, of mass meeting encounters and skirmishes. This was an interesting period.

I don't know what one can now call the present period from the point of view of whether it is interesting or cheerful. This, probably, should no longer be the issue. Today, when our concept of perestroyka has come up against real society and has touched the interests, the real interests, of people, and society has been set in motion, then we have felt that this is a stage of special importance through which we are now living. How we deal with the time and how we resolve tasks at this stage will determine much for the future.

I said that this summer when the congress was in session. Leonid Maksimovich Leonov had reached the age of 90 at the time, and I visited his home, and we had a brief but very interesting conversation, and I want to mention just one thing from this conversation because it is very important for what I will say later. Leonid Maksimovich, in a discussion about our time, about the searches we are conducting to resolve the tasks of perestroyka, to take our society to those levels that we are calculating to take it to, expressed a very interesting idea: Yes, I am attentively following what is happening in the country—and I was indeed surprised at how much he knew in detail about everything taking place in the country.

Moreover, this is not simply a kind of collection of information, this was an interpretation by this very wise, philosophically minded person; he expressed his opinions which boil down to the fact that the most complicated thing at the moment consists of the following: on the one hand, what you are doing will determine what our society will be like for 100, 150, 200, and perhaps for 300 years ahead; but we are having to go toward new forms of life and to master them, and to search, in a very complex situation, when many problems have accumulated in society, problems which worry people and which disrupt normal processes of life, in general, everything which saddens and alarms our people and which disorganizes to a certain extent their everyday lives. And it is very important, he said, that in resolving these problems—they cannot be evaded for they are people's life—[Gorbachev changes thought] and we surely cannot count on the success of perestroyka if we do not bother about our people feeling today what perestroyka gives, not only from the point of view of democracy and glasnost, confidence and human well-being, but also from the point of view of material and cultural conditions of one's life. We must do this. But we must resolve these problems in such a way that the main thing is not forgotten—the direction that we have chosen for proceeding along the road of perestroyka. Yes, I must say this, he is correct.

Look, we have now come to a stage when we are thoroughly occupied with issues of radical economic reform, including such cardinal issues as the reforming of property relations, which should radically change the economic basis. We may once again repeat what was said by Ilich, in point of fact we are in this way implementing a radical change in the point of view on socialism, via reforming property relations, via the opening up of the potential of socialist public ownership. We must do this. Look what a very interesting and simultaneously contradictory process this process which is connected with the implementation of political reform has turned out to be. We see that we have chosen the correct direction here as well, but this is moving forward in a very contradictory and irregular way, and anxiety is being provoked by it among all sides in society. And we are dealing with such fundamental problems, which really do signify a revolution within a revolution. We, at the same time, must concern ourselves with reducing acuteness in society. Today this is the main thing, comrades. Moreover, we understand this to a certain an extent and we take all this so close to heart, both what the people are going through and their critical attitude toward the fact that the situation looks as it does today.

We understand all this, and it is close to us; we must solve and remove these problems. This is why they have to be removed; we have to urgently clear away everything, all the tension, in a matter of months or in the next 12 to 18 months, so to speak. In general, there are already attempts to exploit that tension, from both right and left, eh? [unidentified speaker answers: "That's right;" another speaker says: "Yes"] You know, when somebody simply tries to frighten us with the suggestion that we have set off too quickly along the road of perestroyka, well, that's one thing. As for the person who criticizes us for going too slowly and says we must accelerate almost to a gallop, we could reconcile ourselves to all that and react more calmly to it.

But we must now make an appropriate assessment of those views. Why? Because from both right and left, from both these extreme right-wing and extreme left-wing positions—from extreme positions, I would say there are attempts to infiltrate their opinions into society, to introduce confusion into society, to muddle people's thinking, to sow lack of faith in our current affairs. I think today this is one of the most important tasks of the party and the party press—to bring home to our people the meaning of what is taking place in society, so no one might yield to the temptation of responding to these very dangerous slogans.

I have already had occasion to speak about this, and I will repeat this constantly, because there is danger here, comrades. PRAVDA people must bear this in mind and conduct an open dialogue with the working people. We need our people to know we are devoted to perestroyka, that perestroyka is in the interests of the people, and that the most active efforts are being made today in the

Central Committee of the party, in the Supreme Soviet, and in the government, to remove the social and economic acuteness in society.

When I say this, we should of course understand that obviously not everything depends on those at the top, if we use this expression to describe the whole center, but a lot does. We have to create political, economic, and legal prerequisites to get the processes both in the market and in the field of finance under control, to normalize the situation here. Today that is the most important point. Much should also be solved in the labor collectives themselves, however, To saturate our market with goods, but goods are not produced in offices, they are produced at enterprises. That is why, naturally, we can hardly count on the success of our work if there is no such understanding among our working people.

In this sense we are trying all the time to keep repeating the same simnple idea: All in all we have to create everything with our own hands. I think that by combining all the scientific and creative forces of our society we will reach the right solutions—the right solutions for improving the financial situation and the situation in the consumer market, and the right solutions for extending and continuing the economic reform.

I do not consider myself gullible, but nevertheless through analyzing the realities and even the entire contradictory nature and tension of the present situation, I view things optimistically. We can overcome, stop the further development of negative processes, and turn the situation for the better, toward improvement. This will require fairly vigorous efforts. I have already said sometime that perhaps we will have to resort to certain unpopular measures. What do we mean by unpopular measures? If these measures are needed for getting the situation under control and changing it for the better, then ultimately we can hardly say these are unpopular measures. Ultimately, they are needed for the people.

And I would very much ask PRAVDA journalists to concentrate now on constructive work, on constructive work.

We have already told one another that the situation is exacerbated, that the position is a grave and difficult one. But we have also said and we see and we have established that there are opportunities for getting out of it. These opportunities have to be brought into play. This is to be done by all mass media and PRAVDA must set the tone in these matters.

In 32 oblasts of the Russian Federation events are developing fairly progressively and the situation is changing for the better. The position on the market is changing. The situation is becoming normal in the oblasts and in the regions where there was much tension, the entire situation was tense, just as in our chernozem zone.

Today you have written a great many positive things in PRAVDA: about Voronezh, [man prompts: "Kaluga"] you have also written about Kaluga, you have probably also written about Tambov. [man's voice is heard mentioning Orel]. But listen, Orel. Yes, Orel, listen. Interesting changes are taking place there today.

On the whole I am not inviting you to abandon a critical approach in life. No, one needs to interpret things critically. That is very important to us. But everything must be permeated by the main idea of constructive work, the idea of consolidation of society, of the pooling of efforts in all areas. This is important to us now because we are coming to the adoption of radical decisions, whose realization must be followed by major changes, which are to bear great fruit for our country.

I think that this is being sensed throughout society now. I felt this when I was soundly—well, I will, so to speak, use such a blunt phrase—driven into a corner by members of the Central Committee and candidate members of the Central Committee. You probably paid attention to that. [man says: "It was good"] It was good, yes? You rejoiced? [Same man: "No, I did not rejoice. It was a normal process."] [Gorbachev laughs] A normal process. Yes, they raised a question before me, which in my view was correct. Why is it that the topic of labor, of patriotism, of actions for the sake of the fatherland is expressed in a muffled way in the mass media?

But surely people make this history, they live, they make their contribution, dedicate their hearts, souls, and minds to it, how can this not be written about? How can this not be spoken about? All the same, our main hero is surely the reformer. He has now changed a lot. He is not a sweet person or an accommodating one. No, he is often an ill-adjusted person in his demands, his approaches, but this is exactly the nature of a man who is involved in perestroyka.

And I think we need to speak about the nature of this perestroyka, this person, and to speak at the top of our lungs, at the top of our lungs. We have brought The 28th Party Congress closer; this is not coincidental, we have consciously moved toward this. We must also absorb a lot in preparing for the congress. We must come to understand perestroyka in depth, where we have arrived, and what we have gained. We must understand the slips and errors so far in the stages of perestroyka. We must outline the immediate tasks, as the party—which is fulfilling the role of the political vanguard—understands them. It seems to me that we are justified in stating that the whole of our society worries that the party should be strong, that it renew itself more quickly, and that it master its new role at the present stage of perestroyka. This pre-congress period should resolve quite a lot and should also respond to many things.

We think that by the spring we must come out with a program document which should be, I should say, a pre-congress platform of the Party Central Committee and a basis for all-party discussion. Then this document should be adopted as a program document of the party at the congress. Now that we have been drawn into a discussion of urgent measures for improving finances and the market, into a discussion of the plan for the year 1990, and into a discussion of laws connected with reforming the economic relations in all spheres of our economy, we have felt that there is some kind of lack of understanding, which prevents us from getting on with formulating united approaches that would guarantee our successfully implementing the tasks of perestroyka and achieving the aims of perestroyka.

What is the matter here? I think it is a matter not only of the fact that a search is going on. These are not simple questions. They really require discussion, comparison of views, in order to work out approaches that can be used as the basis of policy and practical activity. It is not a matter of that. I think the starting point in these discussions has turned out to be varied. And therefore this process of working it out is proceeding with difficulty. Indeed along with the concept of perestroyka as a policy directed at the renewal of socialism, at the values of socialism, via democracy, glasnost, via the elevation of man, via the humanization of our society, we are being offered such values that would invite us to virtually return to 70 years ago. As if those 70 years had not existed. As if the life of whole generations had never been. As if nothing had happened to our society. A very great deal has happened, much of that which has made our country what it is from the point of view and according to the strictest standards is nevertheless a huge breakthrough, a huge achievement in contemporary human civilization, despite all that was tragic and traumatic, despite all the deformations which complicated and slowed down, perhaps, the realization of the socialist ideal.

All that did happen; but, nevertheless, there are grounds for stating that our historical path is a unique achievement in contemporary civilization. Therefore, if you do not see that, you can be very seriously deluded and throw up the sort of theoretical concepts which can, in general, produce the wrong kind of shoots. Therefore, in the period leading up to the congress we need this broad discussion, which would give us the opportunity to come to the congress with a serious document setting out our program, and which would give society an assured prospect for the immediate future. I am not even mentioning the fact that, as we approach the congress, we must give thorough consideration to all aspects relating to the activity, the life and activity, of the CPSU, taking account of the point that in a society which is renewing itself, we need a renewed party that operates with regard for and in the context of the changes that are going on within the framework of perestroyka and the democratization of society, a party that would fulfill the role of the political vanguard successfully in this atmosphere. In connection with this, we need to adopt a new approach to everything: the report-back and election campaign, the election of delegates, and the formation of elective party bodies; but we also need to discuss thoroughly ideas connected with renewing the party statute.

That, even if just expressed briefly, is the task facing us in connection with preparing and holding the congress. But no less important are the forthcoming elections and formation of organs of power in the republics and the elections of local soviets. This is a highly important political campaign, through which we want to accomplish the transfer of power to the soviets. Take a look at the battles that are unfolding in society and the passions that are raging, just in the lead-in to it! For those who were at the Supreme Soviet, today's discussion showed this once more, since it was about the amendments that need to be made to the Constitution, in Article 13, which deals the election system.

We equally had to organize a debate and instruct committees to work on these questions, and then again submit them for the final approval of the Supreme Soviet. All this is very important for the life of the country, for perestroyka to move and grow in strength.

There is, of course, the subject of the role of the press, and that is what we are talking about, and— in connection with this role—there is the responsibility of the press, the subject of the responsibility for the press. Recently I have had to talk about this to some comrades, during a meeting at the party Central Committee with mass media leaders. We have to overcome the negative things that have lately appeared in the mass media. We, in the Central Committee, are very interested in the role of the mass media continuing to be active, constructive, and creative. We, and I think the whole society, are very interested in this being precisely so. I do not think we have to change anything fundamentally in our approaches, we in the Central Committee, since our position proceeds from the interests of perestroyka, the interests of the people. I do not think things would work out for is without the mass media continuing to participate actively in this entire process, the process of perestroyka. They wouldn't, I am deeply convinced of that. But now, when we have entered the second stage of implementing the conception of perestroyka, when society needs reliable points of reference, our press should not create confusion in the media.

It should help find the correct solutions, answers, and approaches, as to how to ensure the success of perestroyka. I think this is the most important thing now. And that means that the press and all editorial collectives must be freed of personal bias. I do not mean that a creative person can lose his identity; he must have one. Without that there is no vigorous and interesting press. Each realizes his own potential, contributes his own spirit, yes, but we must nevertheless see the main point, the supreme point, as being to promote the value and idea of perestroyka, to affirm the positive, progressive trends, and resolutely work to overcome all the negative ones.

To really part with the past, with all that recently comprised our life, is not an easy task. It is not easy for you and me. It is not easy to do in each working collective. It is not easy in each family and for each person. And this process has to be shown, how it is really going. But all the same this must be done with clean hands, with clean intentions, and above all, with anguish for our cause, for the country's fate, for people. When that is present, comrades, everything will come right, and sessions and pep talks are not needed. All that is needed is exchanges to urge people to think and seek. That is natural. That is needed in any creative collective, a certain environment and a certain atmosphere. But what I have said is very important. A newspaper, especially, and there can be no question of PRAVDA, any paper, the one orientated to even the most narrow circle of readers, must not be turned into someone's fiefdom. After all, the press is a public matter, and it must serve society, and if today society is taking the road of perestroyka and renewal, then that is what it should serve.

At one time we introduced criteria of glasnost and criteria of democracy. I should say that nothing has changed and I think it is true that these criteria, spoken some time long ago, maintain their force. I am referring to service to the people, how it works for the people, for the interests of the people, for socialism. In recent times, some people have been trying to remove the second part of this formula, "for socialism", how it works for socialism. Because serving the people can be treated in any way. But put together this way everything remains in place. Before its own people, before the whole world, the party has declared firmly, precisely, clearly, and out loud: We remain loyal to our choice. We shall carry out the restructuring and renewal of our society to our own values. And that is our cause, our sovereign cause. We are not imposing our perestroyka on anyone, but we shall conduct it as we understand it. And this has encountered support. I must say people are following very attentively what is happening in the country and to what extent it corresponds to the socialist ideal which people have kept in their soul and heart and mind, despite all the trials of our destiny.

## Ligachev Interviewed on Perestroyka, Party

*wa2310185089 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 42, 21-27 Oct 89 pp 1-3*

[Interview with Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent N. Zhelnorova, on 26 September 1989, place not given: "Socialism Has a Colossal Resource and It Cannot Be Improved by Capitalism"—ARGUMENTY I FAKTY headline]

[Text] [Zhelnorova] While we have had a great deal of faith in perestroyka over the past more than 4 years, as our readers write, we have received nothing appreciable. What do you think of this, Yegor Kuzmich?

[Ligachev] The question is understandable. Let us think about it. First of all one must think about the numerous, and sincere statements from our own people: "We are not the same people." Indeed, we have changed over the years. Our people can express their ideas and considerations openly, without falsehood. The proposals of the workers and public opinion exert a real influence on the decisions that are made in the country. The party actually has included millions of people in the management of society and has enriched the composition of its cadre. I, for example, consider this a great achievement of perestroyka.

Further, there have been achievements, and considerable ones, in the social sphere, and I emphasize that the economy is increasingly on the move in this direction. Let us turn to statistics. During the 3 years of the current 5-year plan, as compared to the corresponding period of the last one, 15 percent more housing has been built, and 26-38 percent more schools, hospitals, and other facilities of the sociocultural complex. These are the highest rates and scale of construction of facilities for the people's environment in all of the 45-year period since the war.

There are also achievements in the production of food and other consumer goods. In particular, we have produced 9 percent more agricultural products. But society does not experience this increase strongly. In the first place, the growth rates are still inadequate, and in the second place the growth of the population's income is 18 percent and is outpacing the growth of commodities. Labor productivity is increasing significantly more slowly.

Such are the statistics; such are the facts. And on the whole, of course, the changes are not what we would all like them to be.

We ourselves are probably to blame for generating certain illusions regarding perestroyka. With the best intentions, of course. It seemed to us that many of the country's problems could be solved quickly. But in fact—and we can see this now—perestroyka will take a fairly long period of time. Not a year or two, but considerably more. I understand that this statement will not add to my popularity, but these are the facts. It is better to be realistic.

There are now a lot of ideas and advice about how to bring the national economy out of a difficult situation. There are interesting suggestions. But I shall tell you the main thing: It is impossible to modernize socialism and heal the sore spots in our economy by methods of capitalist management, of course, when it comes to the most basic things. But if we have in mind acceptable elements, then we undoubtedly can and should take everything useful from foreign experience. There is much that is valuable and effective not only in the West, but also in the socialist countries.

Economic laws of development have begun to be seriously violated in our country. We are violating the proportionality, the planning, and the optimal ratio between the masses of commodities and money and, as I have already mentioned, between labor productivity and wages. The reason for this is the imperfection of the economic and legal mechanism for management, and also local and departmental prejudice when group interests are given precedence over the interests of society. This is what we must fight against—and seriously.

There are now ideas to the effect that socialism has all but failed and public ownership of the means of production leads to man's alienation from the results of his labor and that we must return to private ownership.

[Zhelnorova] Would you not support this or even allow it in any forms?

[Ligachev] I do not support it. Socialist ownership in all of its forms has shown that when we observe the laws and update the methods and means, when we work correctly, it is sufficiently effective on the social and economic planes. I do not agree with those who say that private ownership and unemployment cannot harm socialism. In my opinion, all of this will ultimately lead to an exacerbation of the social stratification of society and an undermining of political stability.

That is, we have no need for private ownership. Socialism has a colossal resource and it must be utilized skillfully and actively, this being approached, of course, in a modern way. I attach special significance to the deepening of economic reform, improvement of the forms of realization of socialist ownership, the inclusion of all levels of the economy in relations of economic accountability [khozraschet], the new price and tax policy, and control over the mass of money. Political and economic methods of leadership in combination with organizational and educational work, socialist competition in the collectives, and real concern for the people can produce real results. Perestroyka and continuity are the basis of the policy.

[Zhelnorova] What is your attitude toward such laws of recent years as the laws on the state enterprise and cooperation, and the "anti-alcohol" ukase? In some people's opinion these were not justified.

[Ligachev] Let us take, for example, the law on the state enterprise. It gave a broad opportunity to many enterprises and collectives to solve for themselves the problem (on the basis of contractual commitments) of production of a considerable proportion of one product or another. And it turned out that now many goods are simply not being produced. And that which is produced is not always of good quality and frequently it is sold at a very high price. A fairly large number of enterprises have appeared which earn profit mainly through increasing prices.

Now about cooperation. In the country there are good cooperatives where ambitious, competent people with initiative are working. I have encountered many of them. These cooperatives produce useful products and at normal prices. At the same time under the flag of cooperation there are forces that destabilize the social and also the political situation. They engage in speculation and unabashedly get rich on the deficit, which makes the people indignant. This was discussed recently at the Central Committee plenum, at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and at the plenum of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions].

If one is to speak about cooperatives as a whole, I think they should have the same rights and opportunities as all other forms of production and realization of socialist property. Then it will be possible to see which is the most effective.

People frequently write that V.I. Lenin described socialism as a structure of civilized cooperatives. But this is just pa[illegible] Lenin's definition. In reality Vladimir Ilich wrote [illegible] socialism is a "structure of civilized cooperatives with public ownership of the means of production." This is an essential aspect. It must be kept in mind, the more so since the development of cooperation is sometimes associated with hired labor and speculation.

The question naturally arises: Where is the solution? First of all we must prepare the laws more carefully and anticipate the consequences of the decisions that are made. Herein lies the wisdom of leadership. At the same time in the process of enforcement of the laws, if necessary, one should make adjustments (as the USSR Supreme Soviet did with the laws on the state enterprise and cooperation). But it is important not to delay, to do it promptly. And, of course, the laws must be strictly observed. This is perhaps the main thing.

About the anti-alcohol ukase. There is obviously no need to remind you how the people breathed a sigh of relief when in 1985 we cracked down on drunkenness and raised an obstacle to this terrible evil. But it does not figure how we can fight against drunkenness and alcoholism and at the same time continuously increase the production of alcohol.

In 1965 we sold 15.5 billion rubles' worth of wine and liquor products, and in 1984—53 billion rubles' worth. Then there was a sharp reduction. By the end of this year we shall sell less than 50 billion rubles' worth. In justification people say that here we see the effect of increasing the output in terms of price, but in terms of the actual number of decaliters we are producing less. But does this make it easier? Instead of spending more of his budget on the family, a person goes to the wine counter and spends it there.

Certain people assert that it is necessary to increase the sale of alcohol because the budget is "cracking." But we know that drunkenness causes production, and daily life, and the spiritual life of society to crack! It seems to me that we must avoid this in any case. If our society had not engaged in the fight against drunkenness and alcoholism in time (although somewhat late), it would simply have perished. Therefore it is quite wrong to return to the previous line.

I am very disturbed by the fact that in many places (this is evident from letters and newspapers) people are appearing drunk on the streets and even in production. A dangerous symptom. It is necessary to use all measures against drunkenness—economic, legal, educational, medical, administrative.

Some people, incidentally, have linked the sugar problem to home distilling of liquor. There is no doubt that a certain amount of sugar is being used for moonshine. According to statistics, millions of tons of sugar were used for this evil previously as well. As concerns the sugar shortage, it arose because, for example, last year we failed to produce 1.6 million tons of sugar. Sugar refineries in the country are in neglected condition, and many of them were built before the revolution. We need a plan of action here.

[Zhelnorova] You are the chairman of the CPSU Central Committee commission on questions of agrarian policy. We would like to know your opinion about the March Central Committee plenum.

[Ligachev] The March plenum developed a modern agrarian policy. Its essence amounts to the following: improvement of production relations in rural areas on the basis of economic accountability, leasing, and cooperation in combination with scientific and technical progress and social restructuring of the rural village. This is the socialist path of development. This direction was taken and is being taken by agriculture, for example, in the GDR and Czechoslovakia (recently a group of comrades and I studied in detail the agroindustrial complexes in these countries) where the population is fully supplied with food products.

I am convinced that we are on the correct path. But there is one large problem here. In terms of the way it is built up technically and socially, our rural village lags far behind those in developed countries. World practice has this indicator: the proportion of fixed capital per 100 hectares of agricultural land. In the GDR for every 100 hectares there are 550,000 rubles' worth of fixed capital. In our country this figure is 62,000 rubles. Take, for example, the Moscow and Baltic areas where the capital availability is the same, and therefore productivity is the same. And in Gorkiy Oblast where capital supply is one-third as much, the productivity is one-half as much.

The technical supply for our peasant is worse by a factor of 3-4 than that of the peasant in the GDR or Czechoslovakia or the American farmer. Our peasant has 33 horsepower available, while the American farmer has 142.

This the main answer to the question that is frequently asked about why our kolkhozes and sovkhozes do not provide the country with enough food. Of course, inefficiency also has an effect. All of us must understand: Until we provide our peasants with really enough technical equipment and a socially satisfactory life (so they have a well-equipped work place and a comfortable apartment, normal roads, full municipal services, and earnings not less, but more than those of the average worker, as is the case in many countries), until such time we will not receive enough food. Here is a brilliant assertion: If things are bad for the peasant, they cannot be good for the society in which he lives. I take my hat off to our peasants, who are providing the people with the most necessary things under difficult conditions.

[Zhelnorova] Why do we have such low wages in rural areas?

[Ligachev] Because productivity is lower than it is in industry and procurement prices for many kinds of agricultural products are lower than the socially necessary expenditures. The proportion of manual labor is great in rural areas (up to 70 percent). Prices for agricultural equipment, materials, and fertilizers are increasing. Do you recall how disturbed the deputies were when they raised this question at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies?

In a word, in addition to better utilization of the means available on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, our farms need large amounts of material-technical and monetary resources in order to create the necessary conditions for the labor and life of the peasant. Then labor productivity will be higher and there will be more products.

[Zhelnorova] But how do you explain this miracle: That 3 percent of the land in private subsidiary farms produces 24 percent of the agricultural products? Some people wonder why we need kolkhozes and sovkhozes when people manage to achieve these results on their own land without good equipment and science.

[Ligachev] You know, I value highly the private farm or, as we now say, the family farmstead. Their share is indeed appreciable, especially in the production of milk, meat, potatoes, vegetables, and fruits (not grain or industrial crops, of course).

But here one must keep in mind that the miracle is taking place because the family farms are integrated with the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and are utilizing the land intensively. The family receives young animals, feed, seedlings, and high-quality seeds from the kolkhoz or sovkhoz and has the possibility of borrowing equipment. It has the right to dispose of its own products—more advantageously. If one is to explain this completely there is one more miracle in that while obtaining less wages than they do in the city, the peasant must also work properly on his own farm and enlist his family members in this in addition to working in public production. His private farm provides him with 20-40 percent of his income.

Some people think we should rely primarily on the small private farm. Recently I was speaking with a well-known American agrarian banker, John Crystal, who advised not touching the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and emphasized that American agriculture is taking the path of consolidation.

I think we should rely mainly on large collective farms for they provide the country's basic supply of products.

But this does not mean that we should not create small peasant farms as well. As concerns the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, they are in need of restructuring on the basis of cooperation and economic accountability. We must allow the development of family and peasant farms and definitely provide for the processing and sale of their products, and also provide them with a sufficient quantity of small technical equipment.

[Zhelnorova] There arises the question of increasing output, but an immense quantity of what is raised and produced goes to waste. Apples and potatoes rot and each year millions of tons of meat, millions of tons of grain, and so forth go to waste. Perhaps we should work from the end instead of the beginning; not produce more but save what we have.

[Ligachev] The losses are indeed incredible. We are reaping the results of the policy that has been adhered to for decades. We thought that the more we produced, the more we would have on our counters. It turns out that this is not true. With the system of storage, transportation, and processing we have, the more we produce the more we lose. This is why we are now working hard on creating a modern food industry. By 1995 we must modernize and reconstruct 70 percent of the food enterprises. Tens of billions of rubles have been allotted for this. During 3 years of the current 5-year plan we have put into operation about a thousand processing enterprises and increased the capacities of storage facilities by 20 percent. In addition to the creation of large and medium-sized food industry enterprises we are not rushing the creation of small ones located near the places where agricultural products are produced; that is, on the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and agricultural combines.

[Zhelnorova] What is the purpose of the numerous seminars that are being conducted in the oblasts and republics? The economy is not subject to decrees and exhortations. Is this simply a matter of appearing to do something?

[Ligachev] What do you mean; why be so simplistic? After certain political goals and principles have been developed it is necessary to engage in organizational work. This is why we are visiting the local areas frequently and checking on how correct our policy is and whether or not we have made the right decisions.

[Zhelnorova] Why do they always show you going only to the best farms? After all, everything would go well there anyway.

[Ligachev] That is wrong; I visit poor farms and those that are operating at a loss as well. It is important to know and study everything that is valuable; that is, what is being done in the agroindustrial complex. And it is impossible to teach or educate a person using a bad example; people must be taught using the experience created by the people themselves. In general I cannot picture my life or work without constant communication with the people; a workday when we take those trips lasts 12-14 hours. Each time the meetings and conversations must be charged with energy. What a diversity of experience, approaches, and means of solving problems!

[Zhelnorova] Now voices are speaking out and saying that we should take better advantage of historical experience. Perhaps it would be better not to dig up others' mistakes (although they have made them), and it would be better not to commit our own.

[Ligachev] A large amount of work has been done: The names of worthy people have been restored to the memory of our people. But along with the restoration of the historical truth there has been a certain amount of debunking of Soviet history. I consider this a grave mistake. It is as though the people have been robbed. In the history of any country we can find pages of heroism and courage of the people. The knowledge of them can help to overcome difficulties. But now the "hawks after literary effect" have done such a job on our history that it will take many years for historians to figure out what is the truth here and what is falsehood.

This is not children's games but real sabotage against our homeland. Here everything frequently smacks of cynicism; it is mockery of those who under difficult conditions built and defended socialism and created much that is now being used by the younger generation.

We have before us the 45th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. It would be good, on the threshold of this event, to extensively discuss the patriotism of the people, their suffering, the outstanding role of the party, and the magnitude of our victory and its significance for mankind. The country as a whole has traveled a very long path.

[Zhelnorova] And was this really a Leninist path?

[Ligachev] Yes.

[Zhelnorova] And Stalin—was he also on a Leninist path?

[Ligachev] No. This is a serious departure from socialism which caused us a colossal amount of harm. I know this not only from books, but also from the life of our family.

[Zhelnorova] Now a situation has developed in the country whereby many levers no longer work: Administrative levers have already all but been ruled out and economic ones have not been fully put to work.

[Ligachev] I agree. It is now dangerous to use administrative levers; people will think you are a conservative, a bureaucrat. Many party organizations and party workers have moved away from the economy, as though they are trying to avoid the political responsibility for what has happened. But it is not for us simply to give advice. We must not dictate but organize. We cannot count on political and economic levers automatically working. Large organizational efforts are needed.

[Zhelnorova] People frequently ask why we do not introduce the NEP [New Economic Policy] now and try to take this path which has been proven by Lenin.

[Ligachev] We have different conditions and different tasks now. Commodity-monetary relations are developing fairly extensively in the country. An economic reform is in progress and it is based on the development of economic accountability relations, expansion of the independence of enterprises, and responsibility for the products that are produced. So we are also producing a new but modern economic policy.

[Zhelnorova] But at that time the result was quick and effective. In a couple of years not only did the country's deficit disappear, but there was even a certain amount of abundance. Perhaps today's reforms are not radical or deep enough?

[Ligachev] About the abundance. Of course there was none. Judge for yourself: The per-capita meat consumption in 1928 was only 32 kilograms, and milk—182 kg (last year these figures were 66 and 356, respectively, although this is not enough either).

As concerns our reforms, I would say that it is not so much a matter of how radical they are as how consistent we are in conducting them. There should be an interdependence between political transformations, at whose basis lie processes of democratization, and economic ones, whose core is relations of economic accountability.

We are already moving ahead in changing the political structures and we are significantly lagging behind in the economy. Evidence of this is the serious problems on the consumer market. If we do not improve the consumer market I think the political transformations will be devalued to a considerable degree.

[Zhelnorova] Here you are defending the party but certain readers write that its leading role has done nothing for the people. There is not enough of the most elementary things: soap, food, housing, and public health services are poor in the country. For decades the party has had the opportunity to prove its slogans with deeds. But this has not happened.

[Ligachev] I absolutely disagree with that. We have created a state which even our opponents call a great power. We have immense international authority. And perestroyka was begun and is being conducted by the party.

Socialism is the fruit of the activity of the people themselves. Therefore I clearly adhere to this position: The current transformations can produce colossal success within the framework of the socialist system of management. I see no other way. No matter what we choose, ultimately there are only two paths—socialist and capitalist. What is the point in returning to what has already been? We are being called to repeat what we have learned before, what we have already done. And they dare to call themselves innovators. But I think they are the real conservatives. I am an adherent of communist convictions and scientific socialism.

[Zhelnorova] You say that we are taking the socialist path. But not everyone is convinced they are living under socialism (as it was described in the textbooks). Can the conditions under which certain groups of people live really be called socialism?

[Ligachev] I understand how important it is for a person to have everything he needs. But we must be realistic and not forget what our society has experienced throughout its history. Then we can understand why we do not yet have everything—both because of these conditions and because we have not yet learned to manage in a socialist way, and also because of the ugliness and injustice that exist in our country.

Of course it is very painful that many people are still experiencing great deprivations. I can see no other point in my life than to do something useful for the people. As concerns wages for management personnel, ultimately they are not so different from those of other highly paid professions.

[Zhelnorova] But this is not only and not so much a matter of wages!

[Ligachev] But still we are living in a socialist society and there should be no wage leveling here. A minister has the kind of responsibilities that not every person can handle. Therefore the minister is paid more, although, incidentally, not as much as they are paid in foreign countries. Ministers there receive much more.

[Zhelnorova] It is frequently said that the people are working poorly—this is why they are living poorly as well. But yet many of our party and management workers are not distinguished by their good work either and yet they are living fairly well.

[Ligachev] What can I say—I know their life. The majority of these people are working not for wages and not for any special privileges, but for the cause, for their duty, for the people.

But, unfortunately, among management personnel there are also those who allow abuses. There is also corruption among them. It is necessary to purge the society and the party of these people.

Our cadres are constantly changing and this is natural. But sometimes in some places they become so involved in this that when augmenting the cadre with fresh forces they forget that the cadres must be stabilized. And sometimes with his duties, work load, and work volume, a person is just getting down to work when we replace him. In the past it was the other extreme—stagnation in the cadres.

[Zhelnorova] You said that there are attacks on the party, but does it not turn out that we actually have two pictures: the party of the apparatchiks, which many consider to be the main impediment to perestroyka, and the party of the real communists who are actually in no condition to influence party affairs. It would be interesting to hear a response precisely from you since you have worked with personnel policy and you had in your hands a monopoly on personnel placement.

[Ligachev] No, I have never had any monopoly, for I work in collegial organs—in the Secretariat and Politburo, which solve personnel problems jointly. I wish to repeat once again that I work within the framework of collective organs of the Central Committee and I have no desire for a monopoly.

We do not have two parties. The apparatus is also made up of party members. If the wrong people end up in the apparatus they should be fired and we should augment the party committees with different communists by democratic means. Pay attention to the fact that all attacks on the party have always begun with attacks on the party apparatus.

I should like to repeat that I am in favor of a strict but fair approach to our cadres and party workers. And I was among those who joined the Uzbek Communists in waging an active battle against "Rashidovism" and other immoral phenomena. It is because of those who abuse their official positions that people divide the party into the apparatus and communists. A good deal has been done in this area. It is hard work but it is necessary. This is the task of every communist.

[Zhelnorova] While you were in the post of Politburo member and secretary of the Central Committee did you make mistakes about which you are sorry?

[Ligachev] There were mistakes in dealing with cadres. I am not trying to escape the blame for that.

[Zhelnorova] Readers frequently write that we need a "firm hand."

[Ligachev] A "firm hand" is a dictatorship, one-man rule. I am categorically against that! But we need discipline, organization, and law and order.

Our major strength is not only in the individual, but also in the political line, its implementation, and the restructuring of the party itself. The most important thing for the party now is unity in its ranks. Things have reached a point where communists are departing from internationional positions, although in our multinational society there is no other organization than the CPSU that can lead and consolidate all the forces. In a multinational state we must above all have a one-party system—namely, the system of the Communist Party.

[Zhelnorova] You speak about the need for unity in the party. But yet people frequently say that the party will not develop if nothing opposes it! This is a postulate of dialectical materialism concerning the struggle of opposites... Where there is no struggle there is stagnation.

[Ligachev] It is quite possible to realize socialist democracy within the framework of a one-party system. I do not agree with the comrades who say that democracy presupposes opposition, that without opposition there can be neither the party nor democracy. I think that our party can both take into account and represent the interests of all segments of the workers. And not only take these interests into account, but also satisfy them. The history of the CPSU is evidence of this. Its development means overcoming contradictions within the party.

[Zhelnorova] Why do we enlist practically no women in large-scale state work? I am convinced that if they were in charge of the country all the people would be well fed and shod and would have housing. Although perhaps we would not have such great successes in space and the military sphere.

[Ligachev] I shall go even further: The morality of the people would also be at a higher level. I value women highly: They have an emotional nature and although it is not always opportune, on the whole it is pure and self-sacrificing. I consider it a minus for us that we have been unable to place more women at the highest echelon. But the women, too, must be more active because sometimes when people start to talk to them about more important work, they resist. After all, they do have great family responsibilities.

[Zhelnorova] Although the September (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee considered your well-known statement to the Central Committee and the USSR Procuracy, everything still would have been incomprehensible if I had not touched upon this question in our conversation.

[Ligachev] What can I say? The CPSU charter gives each communist the right "to address questions, statements, and proposals to any party level, right up to the CPSU Central Committee, and demand an answer concerning the essence of his appeal." The Central Committee plenum, after reviewing the materials from the Procuracy, unanimously dismissed the accusations against me as unfounded.

I know that certain "fighters" for perestroyka, in order to achieve their careerist goals, are slandering and spreading false rumors about me. Where do I get my strength? From my belief in the correctness of perestroyka, the political position I occupy, and the support of Central Committee members and party comrades in the central and local areas. I receive many letters and telegrams. I should like to read you a letter from Moscow—a colonel, he is 35 years old, and he writes that he has been in the party for 16 years: "Yegor Kuzmich, in the interests of the party you should, you must stand up under those blows and not yield your party positions. For the sake of the party you must support everything."

And I am doing this. Communists and the Soviet people understand and can figure out what is what, and I believe in our people. On lies, as on one leg, you cannot go far. And history will put all of us in our places.

[Zhelnorova] How are your relations with Politburo members? Whom do you especially trust and to whom are you closest?

[Ligachev] Of course, there are people to whom we are drawn. But on the whole my relations are in the spirit of party comradeship.

[Zhelnorova] What person do you respect most in the country?

[Ligachev] Lenin.

[Zhelnorova] Some people think you are an opponent of Gorbachev and others think you are his alternative. What do you think?

[Ligachev] Neither one. Mikhail Sergeyevich and I came to the Central Committee as like thinkers and we still are, and that is all I shall say. Regarding individual issues we may each have our own judgments—this is natural.

[Zhelnorova] How do you evaluate the current composition of the Supreme Soviet?

[Ligachev] There are many interesting and bright people. And I respect them. The deputies who come from workers and peasants work confidently, somehow steadfastly. I like them because of their openness and directness and their knowledge of life. It seems to me that many people now understand that the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry have been offended by the fact that their representation in the Supreme Soviet has not been the same as the positions they hold in society.

Judgments to the effect that the worker's place is at the machine tool and the kolkhoz worker's place is in the field and only the intelligentsia are capable of managing state affairs are simply groundless conjecture.

[Zhelnorova] Do you have differences of opinion in your family?

[Ligachev] We live in harmony. But we all have our own tastes and attachments. Sometimes there are arguments, particularly about questions of politics and works of art.

[Zhelnorova] Is your family large? What do the people in your household do?

[Ligachev] My wife, my son, my daughter-in-law, and my grandson. My wife, Zinaida Ivanovna, graduated from the Moscow Institute of Foreign Languages; she used to be a teacher, but now she is on a pension and runs the house. She has experienced a lot of sorrow; her father was executed in 1937.

My son Aleksandr is a doctor of physics and mathematics and a department head. His wife Yelena is a candidate of sciences. My grandson Aleksey is studying in a military VUZ [higher educational institution].

[Zhelnorova] What do you like in the sphere of art?

[Ligachev] Symphony concerts, especially when Ye.F. Svetlanov is conducting. Opera performances in the Bolshoy Theater. For many years I have liked the theater and the art of Novosibirsk and Tomsk. I like performances to have deep imagery and meaning; I find this satisfying.

[Zhelnorova] What do you read?

[Ligachev] I like Chekhov and Gogol. I read and reread Gorkiy, Mayakovskiy, and Sholokhov. I read everything significant by Rasputin, Belov, Bondarev, Markov, Ivanov, Gamzatov, Proskurin, Isayev, F. Kuznetsov, and others. I also enjoy historical literature. A couple of days ago I finished reading two books by Professor Skrynnikov. I am now reading "Correspondence on Historical Topics"—about the most crucial moments in history. But I have very little time and I have to read a good deal of current information and economic developments. I also have to work on speeches and articles.

[Zhelnorova] Have you read "GULAG Archipelago"?

[Ligachev] I have.

[Zhelnorova] And newspapers?

[Ligachev] I actively read PRAVDA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, and IZVESTIYA. This list is arbitrary; it would be better to say that I read the newspapers and magazines that are of interest to me.

[Zhelnorova] Where did you go to school?

[Ligachev] I graduated from the S. Ordzhonikidze Moscow Aviation Institute and the Higher Party School under the CPSU Central Committee.

I was born and grew up in Siberia. Later I moved to Moscow three times (I went to school and worked there) but I have always longed for my native regions. In 1965 when I was a deputy department chief of the Central Committee, I was again drawn back to Siberia. I spent a long time going around and trying to arrange this. Finally my request was satisfied and I was sent back to Tomsk Oblast. I worked there for 17 years. There were suggestions to transfer me from the position of first secretary of the obkom to the central organs, but, to put it simply, I dug in my heels. I still have a copy of the notes I used for the request I sent to L.I. Brezhnev in 1981 not to send me as an ambassador and to leave me in Siberia. I got my way. In 1983 Yu.V. Andropov was persistent and they transferred me to the Central Committee. I remember Siberia with special warmth—this is my region, my corner, my home.

[Zhelnorova] Everyone has his own fears, a certain spiritual anxiety. What about you?

[Ligachev] I have anxiety. I am very disturbed by the situation in certain regions of the country. People are undergoing deprivation and suffering and living in fear of their lives. Under these conditions it is difficult to engage in perestroyka, reform, and improvement of life.

## Abalkin Urges Soviets To 'Get Down To Work'

*LD2510163689 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—"Put aside all your disputes, no matter how serious they are, and get down to work," Leonid Abalkin, vice premier and chairman of the State Economic Reform Commission, urged the Soviet people in an interview with the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS.

"Before speaking of radical reforms or transitional measures, it is necessary to stop organisational disarray in the economy and arrest its rapid downslide," he continued. "It is a serious obstacle that people of different walks of life fail to realise. It is an obstacle to the reform, that is to all of us, rather than to the government or to me."

Turning to the country's deteriorating economic position, Leonid Abalkin noted that industrial production grew 0.3 per cent in September. Production in 10 out of the 15 union republics was lower last month than in the corresponding period of last year.

"If we continue to work in this way, it will be hopeless to expect any successful reforms. We do not have bottomless treasure troves."

According to the vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, a paradoxical situation has emerged. It was acknowledged that the situation is dramatic and emergency measures were drawn up, but the government has not received any emergency powers.

Today prompt administrative measures are needed more than at any other time. The government needs freedom of action and trust within the limits of our national strategy and Constitution. Its programme of action must be comprehensive and consistent.

The government is badly in need of public backing and of new effective ideas and productive day-to-day work. The main thing is to understand the crux of the problems and to set about solving them. Public backing is needed today in carrying out programmes, rather than in elaborating them.

## Gorbachev Praises Miners on Avoiding Strike

*PM2410190989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1*

["Letter from M.S. Gorbachev to workers of the Lebedinskiy Mining and Enrichment Combine"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] To Comrades V. Agapitov, V. Boychuk, S. Yerygin, A. Karkeshkin, S. Ryavkin, and N. Shchedrin, members of the mining administration labor collective council, Lebedinskiy Mining and Enrichment Combine, Belgorod Oblast.

Dear Comrades!

A few days ago I read your contribution "About Personal Interest and Collective Responsibility" in the newspaper IZVESTIYA (Footnote: The article by the Lebedinskiy Mining and Enrichment Combine mining administration officials was published in IZVESTIYA No 289, 1989). I will say frankly that I liked both the candor of your views and the way you acted when the thousand-strong collective found itself on the brink of a strike. Reason conquered emotions and the combine's workers spared the country yet another serious shock. You and your comrades, in cooperation with the party city committee, managed to find a constructive way to tackle overdue problems and ensure the satisfaction of the miners' legitimate demands.

I am confident that many, if not all, labor collectives will recognize the profound correctness of your words: No laws or emergency measures as such can ensure either order or sufficiency. Absolutely correct! Only labor, well-organized and justly rewarded labor, only order in the production sphere, bold decisions, initiative, the ability of each and everyone to shoulder his or her share of responsibility for the success of perestroyka, and an honest balance rather than a clash of interests—all this alone can contribute to a real positive change in the situation both in the economy and society. There simply is no other way to weather and overcome the crisis situation. This is why, in my opinion, so much importance for the whole of the country is attached to the experience of your collective, which consciously assumed this stance, set about seeking a way out of the explosive situation that had arisen within the framework of that stance, and found it!

Life today is confronting us all with a difficult choice. Our professional qualities, our persuasions, our ability fearlessly and in Leninist fashion to perceive and speak the truth and to closely combine principledness with patience and tolerance, and our loyalty to the Fatherland are being put to a grim test. It is a complex and difficult test. And, unfortunately, not everyone is managing to pass it as yet. Some people are panicking, some people are trying to foist adventurist decisions and actions on us, while others would very much like to return if not to the thirties than at least to the seventies. However, it has never been extremes which have determined and continue to determine the course of social processes, especially processes that are fundamentally renewing society and all its spheres and changing our life. The progress of these processes is determined by the attitude of the people, by the attitude of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, by nationwide effort. I was so moved by your contribution to the newspaper because it illustrated to me how the working people are interpreting and realizing their outstanding role in perestroyka and how they are assuming the main responsibility for its fate.

Herein lies the greatest hope for the success of perestroyka and the most convincing proof of its growing strength. Let us continue to enhance and augment this strength because it alone opens up the opportunity of resolving our numerous big and small problems that have accumulated over many years.

I wish you, your comrades and families, and all members of the Lebedinskiy combine collective, good health, happiness in your family life, and determination in the implementation of your intentions that are so important for the triumph of the cause of the renewal of our society and its revolutionary perestroyka.

With deep respect

[signed] M. Gorbachev.

I am sending this letter, just like you did, to IZVESTIYA and hope that the newspaper will monitor the implementation of the measures which the workers committee has agreed to with representatives of the administration and the ministry.

23 October 1989.

---

### Yakovlev Chairs Commission To Examine Repressions

*PM2510112589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 October 89 Second Edition p 1*

["In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission for the Supplementary Study of Materials Relating to the Repressions which Took Place in the Period of the Thirties, Forties, and the Start of the Fifties"—PRAVDA headline; unattributed report]

[Text] At the routine sitting of the commission chaired by Comrade Yakovlev a report from the Party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee was heard on the results of an examination of the matter of the party status of individuals who underwent the so-called case of the antiparty counterrevolutionary group of rightwingers of Slepkov and others of the Bukharin school.

In connection with the fabrication of this case from October 1932 through April 1933, 38 people were arrested without the sanction of the procurator. The majority of those accused were representatives of the young Soviet intelligentsia occupying leading posts in central and local ideological institutions, planning and economic bodies.

Among those arrested there were many former students at the Institut Krasnoy Professury [Institute of Red Professors], the IKP, and pupils of Bukharin who had taken an active part in the theoretical and scientific teaching activity of the IKP.

The 33 members and one candidate member of the party who underwent the case were expelled from the All-Russian Communist Party, for the alleged underground, counterrevolutionary activity of the right wingers. The Unified State Directorate collegium, which on 16 April 1933 examined falsified evidence from investigations, and even without having a statement of indictment on the case, sentenced 34 of those involved to various terms of imprisonment on the grounds of having taken part in the counterrevolutionary organization of the right wingers which set as their goal the active struggle with Soviet power and the restoration of the capitalist system in the USSR, and the conduct of active counterrevolutionary activity and counterrevolutionary agitation aimed at the interests of the international bourgeoisie.

Some of those accused were also charged with being supporters of terror against the leadership.

In 1937-1938, the majority of them, in connection with these same and other similar accusations, by sentences of the military collegium of the USSR Supreme Court and decisions of oblast troikas of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs were shot.

During checks it was established that the so-called case of the antiparty counterrevolutionary group of rightwingers of Slepkov and others of the Bukharin school had been rigged, and was investigated with most crude violations of criminal procedural norms. However, only a portion of the individuals who underwent this case were rehabilitated in judicial terms in the fifties and sixties. The others were rehabilitated in accordance with a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of 16 January 1989.

In the process of party control, those political accusations which were made against those involved in the case as they were expelled from the party were found to be uncorroborated. Their theoretical works, which provided the foundation for ways of building socialism in our country were by nature for discussion purposes, and, in a number of areas, were alternatives to the theory and practice of the administrative command and coercive methods promulgated at that time. Therefore, to appraise these views as antiparty and counterrevolutionary, was completely without foundation. There was no conference of rightwingers as such, the organization of and participation in which certain comrades expelled from the party were charged with.

Proceeding from this, the Party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee has restored to the party: A.Yu. Aykhenvald, P.K. Aleksandrov, S.A. Aleksandrov, A.D. Arefyev, A.F. Astrova-Chernikova, P.K. Bashenkov, D.F. Buzin, S.G. Vinogradov, Ye.S. Gasperskaya, I.T. Zhirov, A.D. Zaytsev, B.I. Idelson, N.A. Karev, A.I. Karmalitov, P.Ye. Krotov, V.V. Kuzmin, V.S. Lapkin, T.R. Levin, Ye.M. Lobova-Burenina, D.P. Maretskiy, B.P. Nesterov, V.S. Popov, S.N. Radin, P.F. Sapozhnikov, A.N. Slepkov, V.N. Slepkov, N.A. Uglanov, A.M. Chernukhin, and G.S. Slesarev as a candidate member of the party—all posthumously. Previously restored to the party were Medvedev, Petrovskiy, Khakharev, and Tsetlin.

The decision was taken to restore Bardin to the party; he underwent the so-called case of the Leningrad counterrevolutionary Zinovyev group of Safarov, Zalutskiy and others.

The report of the Party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee was noted.

Taking part in the meeting of the commission were Kryuchkov, Medvedev, Pugo and Razumovskiy. The work of the commission is continuing.

## RSFSR Supreme Soviet Begins Session 25 Oct

*LD2510082489 Moscow TASS in English 0744 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

A session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation the Soviet Union's largest republic, opened in the Kremlin today.

It will consider changes to the republic's constitution and the election law, designed to continue the reform of local government started late last year at union level. The new legislative acts aim to expand the autonomy of local bodies of power and make their election more democratic. The session will work for three days.

### Electoral System To Be Debated

*LD2510134689 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports:

The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, which opened in the Kremlin today, is discussing bills to democratize the election system and structurally reshape the administrative organs of the biggest union republic of the USSR.

Submitting the bills on amendments to the Constitution and on the election law of the Russian Federation, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, president of the republic's Supreme Soviet, said they would give more rights to republican administrative bodies, would make the local soviets more independent, and would further democratise the election system.

The bills envisage the formation of a new supreme organ of state power in the Russian Federation—the Congress of People's Deputies. It will comprise 1,068 deputies elected in multi-candidate elections for a term of five years. Hitherto its functions were discharged by the republic's Supreme Soviet which met in brief sessions usually twice a year. Now it is planned to make the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation a permanently functioning parliament elected from among congress members.

The Supreme Soviet will have two equal chambers—the Council of the Republic and the Council of Nationalities. At present it is a one-chamber parliament. This is an important novelty for the Russian Federation which includes 31 autonomous formations.

The Council of the Republic will be elected proportionally to the number of voters. Equally represented on the Council of Nationalities will be each autonomous republic or autonomous region irrespective of population. This will allow better stock to be taken of the specific interests of each national formation.

Vorotnikov said that most of the new initiatives received support during the two-month discussion of the bills. Different viewpoints were also expressed, however. It was suggested, for instance, that the president of the Supreme Soviet should be elected by direct vote.

Insomuch as the law, approved yesterday by the USSR Supreme Soviet, leaves this question within the competence of the republics, Vorotnikov insisted that the president should be elected by the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

The other disputed provisions include the formation of electoral constituencies not only according to the territorial, but also the production principle. The advocates of this proposal believe that not only people living in a given district or town are entitled to vote, but also those who work there. Employed in Moscow, for instance, are several hundred thousand people permanently residing in the suburbs. The opponents of this idea believe it is an attempt to "meddle with their internal affairs."

The report offers a compromise solution—to check the proposal experimentally.

Debates on Vorotnikov's report will begin at the evening session.

## Kazakov Relieved From RSFSR Post

*LD2410131789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow, 24 Oct (TASS)—The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium released Vasiliy Kazakov from his post as deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers in connection with his retirement.

## Further on RSFSR People's Front

*LD2310183789 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Text] Yaroslavl October 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nelli Grigoryan:

A Popular Front of the Russian Federation, the USSR's biggest constituent republic, was set up at a congress of informal public movements in Yaroslavl between October 21-22, as "a movement for the renewal of Soviet society on a platform of democratic socialism."

More than 120 delegates from Russian cities represented the plurality of views and trends that have emerged lately in society.

The keenness of debate at the congress was determined by the diversity of opinions on many issues held and expressed by delegates.

The delegates were quite a mixed-bag. Representatives of the Moscow-based club "Communists for Perestroyka" talked with the group "Christian Patriotic Union" whose motto is "For Faith, Tsar and Motherland". The "Popular Patriotic Front" pressed for the revival of Russia's grandeur and exchanged views with the anarchist Tula-based club "Slavs". Delegates from ecological, religious and cultural societies and organisations were present.

The majority of the congress supported a platform that provides for the transfer of all power to democratically elected soviets, or councils, for the renunciation of violence in handling political, national and religious problems, for the implementation of principles of rule by law in the republic and for balancing its development on the basis of diverse economic forms.

People's Deputy Sergey Belozertsev, who took part in the congress, believes that the new association "will help resolve the crucial task of consolidating all forces to hold democratic elections."

In his view, the Popular Front can "substantially influence the democratic solution of a whole number of issues in politics, economics and ecology, the status of religious communities, social and legal protection of the individual, and other questions discussed at the congress."

## RSFSR Deputies, Voters Establish 'Club'

*LD2410210189 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—A voluntary public club called Rossiya (Russia) was established in Moscow today. It united a large group of Supreme Soviet people's deputies representing the Russian Federation and voters from many cities and villages of this, the largest Soviet republic.

One of the club objectives is to rally Russian Federation deputies and their supporters. They will work together towards the solution of Russia's problems, a socialist renovation of society and the realization of genuine democracy in practice.

The club members will draft initiatives and openly discuss bills drafted or submitted for the consideration by the Soviet parliament or a Congress of People's Deputies.

Another important objective is to help maintain permanent links among deputies, voters and work collectives and interaction with state and public organizations functioning within constitutional frameworks.

The club plans to put out information materials about its activities.

People's deputies, prominent scientists, industrialists and people in culture were elected to the club board. The draft rules were adopted. They will be endorsed after a discussion by the republican public.

The rules state that any people's deputy, as well as any citizen adhering to the club platform, may become a member.

"Our club is not an exclusive cell. This voluntary public organization is open to representatives of all republics and each and every nationality," the club's co-chairman Deputy Veniamin Yarin stressed.

The club founders include the RSFSR Writers' Union, the newspaper "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA", the magazine "NASH SOVREMENNIK" (Our Contemporary), the public committee for rescuing the Russian Volga River, the All-Russia Culture Fund, the United Front of Russian Workers and the Yedinstvo (Unity) Movement.

## Moscow Radio Anniversary; Changes Foreseen

*LD2510111989 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—"The process of fundamental transformations in Soviet society attracts foreigners' attention to the USSR," Aleksandr Plevako, deputy chairman of the USSR State Television and Radio Committee, told TASS. He spoke about the Soviet foreign language radio service on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of Moscow Radio's first foreign language channels, to be marked next Sunday.

The USSR beams its programmes almost 300 hours daily in 77 languages of peoples of the world to over 100 million listeners. The beginning to the Soviet foreign language radio service was laid in October 1929 when a 100 kilowatt station, Europe's biggest at the time, was built, Plevako said.

New realities call for introducing fundamental changes in broadcasting, making radio broadcasts an instrument of consolidating mutual understanding between nations. The Soviet radio broadcasting service is looking for new, more efficient forms such as dialogue, for instance.

Telephone interviews, radio bridges, which link the USSR with cities in the United States, India, West Germany, Britain, Latin America and Africa, have become popular. Radio Moscow holds contests, organizes quizzes and broadens relations with Moscow Radio friends clubs in different countries, their numbers now running into over 800.

Moscow Radio receives about 200,000 letters every day, testifying to the prestige of the Soviet foreign language radio service.

The Soviet foreign language radio service launched a new commercial service last year. Radio Moscow decided to introduce advertising in its programmes, something that no world short-wave service has ever done. A 20-minute weekly programme "New Market" is now beamed to English speaking countries and the centralised "Business Club" is beamed in other languages.

A commercial radio channel, "Moscow Fair", in the leading languages for foreign businessmen in Moscow is planned, Plevako said.

## Republics' Foreign Policy Roles To Expand

*90UI0067A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIA in Russian 13 Oct 89 p 3*

[Article by V. Markov, APN diplomatic reviewer: "Perestroyka in Action; Union Republics in USSR Foreign Policy"]

[Text] Today we can talk about a new approach to the role of union republics in the formation and implementation of the foreign policy course of the country. One of the indications of this is the recent decision by the collegium of the USSR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] to establish a department of republic relations for the first time.

"The innovation in the ministry reflects the radical reorganizations in the Soviet federation that have been on the agenda in recent years and the policy of strengthening the sovereignty of the union republics," says Valentin Nikiforov, deputy minister of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Along with the problems of economics and law and the culture and language of the republics, which are once again coming up in the country, thought is also being given to participation by republics in the foreign policy process and international cooperation. When they joined the Union, the republics turned over the implementation of the main tasks of foreign policy to the jurisdiction of the central organs. However, the right to foreign policy activity, which the republics retained as an integral part of sovereignty, remained up until now as more of a formality.

According to the USSR Constitution (Article 80), the union republics are competent "to enter into relations with foreign states," including the signing of treaties with them and the exchange of diplomatic and consular representations, and also to participate in the activity of international organizations. But it is enough to become familiar with the practice of ministries of foreign affairs that exist in each of the 15 republics to become convinced: The right written into the USSR Constitution, in fact, was not put into effect. The exceptions—the Ukraine and Belorussia in the UN and UNESCO, the exchange of visits along the line of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the central asian republics, and certain others—only confirmed that which became a regrettable deviation from the norm.

"Today, the task actually is to realize the potentials of the republics in the sphere of foreign policy and whatever will promote a thorough development of each of them," notes Valentin Nikiforov.

It is true that small groups that maintained contacts with republic ministries worked previously in the high building on Smolensk Ploshchad. Now questions of coordination of foreign policy activity of the union republics will be concentrated in a new department, headed by Yuriy Kuplyakov, who is a former USSR ambassador to Nigeria.

The participation of republic representatives in discussions of all problems concerning USSR cooperation with bordering states, the arrangement of direct ties between individual republics and these countries, including representation first and foremost in those states with which they maintain economic and cultural ties, and their execution of consular functions—these are the directions in which it is proposed to stimulate the activity of both republic and union ministries.

"We intend to improve significantly the information that is furnished the leadership and the communities of the republics about international and regional problems, especially on the situation in adjacent neighboring states, and to provide them with any assistance which might be required in broadening foreign ties," said Valentin Nikoforov.

How is one to avoid a kind of guardianship over republic ministries and a collision with them over questions that affect the interests of the republics?

"First of all, any such decision should be prepared in a close, democratic dialogue with the republics. Such a dialogue will help avoid the mistakes of the past," the deputy USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs believes.

This presupposes not only the development of close contacts at the working level between the center and the republics, but also a more intimate familiarity by the managers of the USSR MFA with the state of affairs on the spot. The close interaction of the subdivision of Yuriy Kuplyakov with the also recently established department of the union MFA, which is engaged in maintaining ties with the USSR Supreme Soviet, is yet another feature that responds to the needs of the times.

The formation and effective functioning of an optimal mechanism for interaction between the center and union republics requires not a little effort on both sides. But a dual effect of the new approach to raising the role of the republics in foreign policy can already be expected now: It will contribute to the strengthening of the foundation of the Soviet federation and make it really robust, and it will simultaneously increase the return from the new thinking, owing to a more active linkup of the republics with international affairs.

## New USSR People's Deputies Elected 15 Oct

*PM2410090789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report: "In Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] On 19 October a session of the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies was held in Moscow.

It summed up the results of the 15 October elections of USSR people's deputies to replace those for Leninskiy territorial electoral okrug No 413, Voroshilovgrad Oblast, Kalushskiy territorial okrug No 461, Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast, Ukrainian SOviet Socialist Republic [SSR], and Sokulukskiy national-territorial electoral okrug No 342, Kirghiz SSR.

The Central Electoral Commission registered the following as USSR people's deputies:

Pavlychko Dmitriy Vasilyevich, writer, secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Writers Union board, CPSU member, Kiev City, elected for Kalushskiy territorial okrug No 461, Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast, Ukrainian SSR.

Chepelev Nikolay Mikhaylovich, second secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, CPSU member, Frunze City, elected for Sokulukskiy national-territorial okrug No 342, Kirghiz SSR.

In Leninskiy territorial okrug No 413, where none of the five candidate deputies gathered the necessary number of votes, there will be a runoff between the two candidates who received the largest number of votes.

## Zaykov, Belousov Attend Moscow Party Aktiv Session

*LD2410100389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Oct 89*

[Video report from Moscow party and economic aktiv conference by Yevgeniy Sinitsyn, including interview with N.I. Myakoshin, secretary of the Ministry of the Aviation Industry's Party Organization; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today there was a Moscow party and economic aktiv conference on measures to implement conversion at defense industry enterprises and to produce goods for the population and other civilian goods.

[Sinitsyn] Hello comrades, a new task appeared recently—conversion. As someone explained to me, this is when, say, sewing machines are produced instead of tanks. "Instead of" or "together with" [Russian pun: vmesto and vmeste]—this is the fundamental question. If it is "together with," then fewer tanks are produced, or rather, only as many as are required. The hall is filling up, and in the meantime, an interview. [Video shows Sinitsyn seated in an auditorium speaking to Myakoshin] Tell me please, what are you expecting out of this conference?

[Myakoshin] The complex problems related both to financing and developing our capacity and replacing equipment at our enterprises in order to produce consumer goods, equipment for the agroindustrial complex, light industry, medicine, and commerce, requires a different technical, scientific, and production approach. And so, today we should receive a reply about how our economic managers, party bodies, trade union, and other public organizations should operate concerning this very serious, important, and necessary problem and task of today.

Today, of course, both the world situation—the international situation—the policy of our government and Central Committee, and the switch to the defense doctrine help us to reduce these expenditures. And since this is so, then we can pay more attention to matters which actually deal with satisfying the needs of our people—and I think not only of our people.

[Sinitsyn] Taking part in the Moscow party and economic aktiv conference are Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov and Igor Sergeyevich Belousov, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. We will formulate the goal of the conference as: the discovery of the short- and long-term tasks of conversion. It is interesting whether a world has yet been born where tanks and other military equipment will not be made at all, and it will only be "instead of." [Video shows clip of Zaykov seated on platform and Belousov speaking]

## Ukraine's Ivashko on National Minority Issue

*AU2410212589 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 20 Oct 89 p 5*

[Interview with Vladimir Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukranian Communist Party, by Peter G. Feher: "National Minority Issue in the Soviet Union—The Roots of Conflicts"—date and place not given]

[Text] Vladimir Ivashko gave an interview to MAGYAR HIRLAP through the assistance of NOVOSTI.

[Feher] To what extent do the national minority conflicts present a serious threat to the unity of the Soviet Union?

[Ivashko] Such conflicts always have their own roots and are often connected to economic and social problems. At the same time, we should not underestimate nationalism which also caused a lot of trouble and pain here in the Ukraine at the time. Now we are witnessing a development in which, under the pretext of restructuring, certain movements in our republic are trying to disseminate nationalist and separatist ideas. I am convinced that nationalism has nothing to do with what it disguises itself as, namely the preservation of national culture, language, and traditions.

[Feher] At the time of stagnation, we rarely heard about national minority turmoil. Have there really not been such events, or they were simply hushed up?

[Ivashko] Of course, the current national minority problems did not emerge in a void. These problems are the consequences of the distortions of the Leninist national minority policy, because this policy underestimated national variety and the particular features of the peoples' spiritual life. This affected every republic, including ours. Today we must save the Ukranian culture and language. However, the fate of the Tatars of the Crimea continues to be our most severe problem, people who were forcefully resettled during the war and who want to return to their homeland. We try to solve this problem in line with our possibilities, but this issues was suppressed during the period of stagnation. Apathy toward national variety and unsolved social problems are painfully reflected in the national awareness, and caused a sulkiness among these people. Therefore, it is not surprising that these contradictions that have accumulated over many years spilled over onto the emerging restructuring process during the prevailing openness and democratization.

[Feher] Has the wrong policy conducted so far or something else led to national conflicts?

[Ivashko] We are dealing with a series of causes. An administrative system based on instructions from above needed unlimited centralism. This system disregarded the demands of national development. The prevailing official approach did not pay attention to the national minority, social, ecological, and demographic requirements of the extensive economic development, and these requirements caused serious problems. As a result of these factors, the use of national languages decreased and the development of national cultures suffered great damage; and all this was theoretically based on the gradual approach of various nationalities.

[Feher] What urgent measure could ease the national tensions?

[Ivashko] I think that the recently adopted documents could give a strong impetus to creating laws that could develop opportunities for our federation. We should fill our union with new political and economic content and guarantee the implementation of the varied demands of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. This platform not only regards the status of our republics as sovereign socialist states, but, as members of our federation, this platform also creates an economic basis for this by shifting to self-accounting and self-financing.

For the time being, this process is slow. For example, the Ukraine is free to dispose of only 5 percent of its products, and, according to the plans, this figure will be increased to only 42 percent in the future. This is far from being full independence. That is why the economic package deal to be adopted by the Supreme Soviet will be very important, a package deal that includes draft bills on property, leasehold, land, and the use of land. On the other hand, a really equal exchange of goods between republics is inconceivable without an economically-based wholesale price of every product. In my view, the introduction of self-accounting only in certain areas will not lead to results. It is impossible to "build communism" separately in every republic. There is a need for common decisions for everyone. Economic restructuring is progressing slowly for the time being.

[Feher] What is the situation with the national minority issue in the Ukraine?

[Ivashko] The national minority issue is acute in our republic, and there are various reasons for this. First of all, the Ukranian language and culture need to be saved. On the other hand, the Ukraine is an internationalist republic with about 14 million people of many nationalities. We must care for the national development of all these people, irrespective of their size. This work is under way, but it is not going as fast as we would like.

As I already mentioned, the most acute problem is that of the Tatars of the Crimea. These people deserve the creation of conditions for their return to their historical homeland, because this lack of homeland is senseless and inhumane. However, we must maintain a certain degree of gradualness, and I do not see any other way. People need housing, jobs, and they must adjust to today's system. However, a lot is happening, and several tens of thousands of Tatars have already resettled in the Crimea.

We are taking a consistent stand in favor of guaranteeing every citizen of the Ukraine—irrespective of his nationality, be it Russian, Georgian, Bulgarian, Greek, Polish, Hungarian, Moldavian, or another nationality—the possibility to live according to his national demands. Take the Hungarians in the Carpathian Ukraine, for example. Their direct contacts with Hungary are now developing in all areas, without coordinating anything with Moscow. They have national minority centers, and they organize various events there. If any difficulty emerges, we will simply have to analyze the specific issues, and I believe there will be no problems.

## Ukraine Groups Oppose Russian as State Language

*PM2410121189 Kiev LITERATURNA UKRAINA in Ukraine 12 Oct 89 p 1*

[Unattributed report: "A Decision"]

[Excerpt] A joint session of the boards of the Ukraine Writers Union and the T. Shevchencko Ukrainian Language Society, after hearing Yu. Mushketyk's report "Ukrainian Language: Problems and Prospects", decided on the following:

1. To approve the draft bill "On Languages in the Ukrainian SSR" while taking into account the proposals expressed at the joint session and noting that a draft bill which declares the state status of the language of a people on its historical territory should be called "The Law on the Ukrainian Language and Other Languages in the Ukrainian SSR".

2. To support the Leninist principles of solving the nationality question and the internationalist trend of the

CPSU platform, "the Nationality Policy of the Party in Present-day Conditions". However, the Ukraine Writers Union and the activists of the T. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society express concern over the proposal, voiced at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, to grant Russian the status of the all-union state language. Legal confirmation of such status will completely negate the lawful right of each people to its own language and culture and turn the future law on the state status of Ukrainian into an official piece of paper for disguising and implementing the Russification policy which has for a long time been consistently been carried out in the Ukraine by local bureaucratic forces in state, party and public organs, at enterprises, establishments and organizations and in the fields of culture and education.

Russian as the language of interethnic relations is freely developing and spreading more and more throughout the USSR without special measures on the state's part; it is not threatened in any way in Moscow or Leningrad and in the vast area of the Russian federation. At a time of great awakening of national dignity and self-consciousness in all national republics, the official confirmation of Russian as the all-union state language may lead only to a further sharpening of interethnic relations which would contradict the party's new nationality policy.

The presidium of this session is charged with the task of sending on behalf of all its participants a letter to M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the effect that a legal confirmation of Russian as the all-union state language would be unacceptable and that such an act would not correspond to the Leninist attitude to the solving of linguistic problems in a multinational state.

3. To empower the boards of the Ukraine Writers Union and the T. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society with the duty to organize all proposals and observations with regard to the draft bill "On Languages in the Ukrainian SSR", expressed at this session, and submit them to the USSR Supreme Soviet presidium.

It is recommended that a blue-ribbon commission be created at the government level to do the final editing of the draft bill "On Languages in the Ukrainian SSR". It would be comprised of state and public figures, writers, artists, scientists, workers and peasants and from the representatives of various nationalities living in the Ukraine and regarding it as their homeland. [passage omitted]

## Former Rukh Leader Comments on Split in Group

*LD2410123689 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] The (?formal) public organization Rukh, a popular movement for restructuring, held its constituent congress in Kiev only a month ago. Now reports say that a split has occurred in Rukh. Many activists, including the movement's cochairman, Vladimir Grenev, who represented the Kharkov affiliation, withdrew from Rukh. Prof Grenev teaches mathematics at Kharkov's polytechnic institute. Here is how he explains the reason why he withdrew from Rukh.

[Grenev in Russian fading into English report] I think that the leaders of the movement have embarked on a road that is politically wrong, said Vladimir Grenev. We joined Rukh in the belief that the ethnic issue will not be predominant in it; that the movement will be truly democratic and internationalist in spirit. Unfortunately the leaders of Rukh and participants in the congress held in Kiev exaggerated the ethnic issue out of proportion. I think it's because the Rukh leadership comprises largely writers and cultural workers, to whom the problems of language and ethnic culture are sacred. Nevertheless, politics must not be built on this. Ethnic issues cannot be resolved without solving economic and political problems first. Politics, that gave top priority to the ethnic question, leads to a deadlock.

I am firmly convinced of this, and this is what accounts for my differences with Rukh. Having withdrawn from Rukh, we decided to set up a Kharkov Democratic People's Front. We confine our activity to Kharkov. For the time being we do not want to spread it to the Ukraine as a whole. The Kharkov region has enough problems of its own, and the main tasks we have to accomplish belong to the political and economic areas. An important aspect of the activity of the Kharkov People's Democratic Front is that we intend to work in close contact with the regional party and government leaders.

Nowadays, the administrative and party leadership is clearly not homogeneous. There are sober-minded professionals in it, and therefore to oppose the apparatus as a whole is fundamentally wrong. It means extremism. It's essential to form a united front on (?the vertical principle), so to speak; (?pick up) sensible, progressive minded people from all walks of life; join their efforts, and give them an opportunity to bring our society out of the deadlock.

## Armenian Supreme Soviet Postpones 27 Oct Session

*NC2510082989 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper has published a statement issued by the Presidium of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet which states: The expanded meeting of the Presidium of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, held with the participation of USSR people's deputies from Armenia, has found it expedient to postpone the session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet scheduled for 27 October, after taking into consideration the upcoming debate at the USSR Supreme Soviet on issues vital to the country and the republic. The presence of USSR people's deputies from Armenia and a group of deputies from the

Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet at the debate in Moscow is considered essential to the solution of these issues.

### Armenia Blockade Reportedly Persists in New Form

*NC2510094289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1715 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Excerpt] All assurances from the central government that the economic blockade of our republic is of a temporary nature have not been confirmed by the facts. At the same time, the impression created by the mass media that the blockade has been lifted is not (?shown) by the facts. The blockade has in fact changed its nature and is continuing to inflict new damages on the national economy. [passage omitted]

### Armed Protection for Trains Increased

*PM2410183789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 First Edition p 1*

[Own correspondent Major L. Gusakov report: "Depressing Statistics. Briefing at the Ministry of Railways"]

[Text] The question of the unloading of freight cars is especially acute today. On the Yerevan railroad section, for instance, there are 4,660 freight cars due to be unloaded. Some 1,500 freight cars are arriving at Leninakan station daily, but only just over 200 get unloaded, of which only 40-50 during the first half of the day.

These depressing statistics were presented to journalists at a briefing held at the USSR Ministry of Railways 23 October.

The situation regarding the safekeeping of goods that are being conveyed to Armenia on the North Caucasus, Azerbaijan, and Transcaucasus railroads continues to cause alarm. During the current week alone 45 units of motor vehicle and tractor equipment and 115 residential chalets have been taken to pieces.

The Ministry of Railways and Ministry of Internal Affairs have been forced to dispatch senior officials to the Transcaucasus to ensure day-to-day leadership of the work of the joint specialized armed guard and internal affairs organs groups.

In addition 120 armed guard staffers have been sent to the Transcaucasus and North Caucasus railroads. In order to ensure freight safety, students from the Ministry of Railways Armed Guard Command Staff Improvement School together with service dogs are being dispatched to the Yerevan section.

However, there is also reassuring news. Goods have finally begun to arrive in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The passage of freight trains destined for Armenia and Georgia along the Azerbaijan railroad has normalized. From 16 through 22 October 9,225 freight cars were delivered to Armenia, including 394 cars containing food, 353 cars containing gasoline, 289 containing diesel fuel, 975 cars containing chalets, 1,533 containing construction materials, and 171 cars containing grain.

### Grants Paid to Azerbaijanis in Armenia

*LD2410151989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Baku, 24 Oct (Azerinform-TASS) The Council of Ministers of Azerbaijan SSR has adopted a decision on once-only allowance payments to citizens of Azerbaijani nationality who have left their place of permanent residence and work in the Armenian SSR. The sum of money paid out will be no higher than the equivalent of 3 months enforced lack of work. The procedure for determining the amount and for paying the allowance has been approved.

The Council of Ministers has made it incumbent upon chairmen of commissions for the reception and resettlement of refugees at town and rayon executive committees of soviets of people's deputies of Azerbaijan to guarantee the payment of the allowance in accordance with approved procedure.

X X X

Yerevan, 24 Oct (Armenpress-TASS)—Payment of once-only allowances to citizens who have left their place of permanent residence in the Azerbaijan SSR has started. The procedure for and amount of of compensation have been determined by a decision of the government of the republic. It indicates that the payment is to come out of local budgets and must be completed by 1 January 1990. It is to be made by the executive committees of rayon Soviets upon application from people resident on their territory. They will receive 3 months pay at a rate of R150 for industrial workers and R100 for workers in the agrarian sector.

### MVD Officer on Troops Deployed in Troublespots

*PM2410201989 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 p 2*

[I. Baranovskiy report on press briefing given by Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops Main Administration: "Not Just by Force of Arms"]

[Text] Today 16,700 Internal Troops servicemen are serving outside their places of permanent deployment. This was stated by Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Internal Troops Main Administration, at a meeting with journalists.

Our troops were created for maintaining order rather than dispersing demonstrations and unauthorized rallies, Yuriy Vasilyevich said. Prior to the events in Alma-Ata in 1986 the need to transfer our formations from place to place on short notice had not arisen.

However, of late the situation in the country has sharply deteriorated. The fratricidal conflicts in Fergana, Sumgait, Novyy Uzen, and the Transcaucasus have made it necessary to dispatch officers and men to these regions.

Today there are 1,800 Internal Troops in Armenia, 3,600 in Azerbaijan, 5,500 in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], 4,500 in Georgia, and 2,300 in Uzbekistan. They are operating locally in accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 28 July 1988.

It is painful to acknowledge that order has to be established by force of arms. Intoxicated by chauvinist slogans, people have unlearned how to get along with each other. Only recently 300 people have perished in interethnic clashes and 5,260 people have been injured. Thousands of houses and cars have been burned, refugees have appeared in peacetime... Twelve servicemen and militia staffers have perished in the course of discharging their duty and 890 have been injured.

There are also other alarming figures. Whereas in 1987 servicemen patrolled 51 cities, the number of such population centers has now increased to 71 and will rise to 121 in the near future. The numerical strength of the Internal Troops will also increase by [as published] 26,700 men. However can peace and calm be introduced in our cities and villages only with the help of bayonets? Have all other means been exhausted?

Not so long ago we used to read in newspapers about Soviet boys in Afghanistan providing an armed escort for goods passing through the Salang. And today Internal Troops servicemen have to do the same thing in Nagorno-Karabakh. By the beginning of October they had escorted more than 600 convoys totaling some 7,000 trucks. These convoys carrying food, people, and equipment were subjected to 235 attacks. More than 30 people suffered as a result. The blockade of the NKAO is continuing. It is still not possible for a convoy to travel freely through the territory of the oblast without an armed guard.

Since February 1988 several thousand firearms and 1,953 kg of explosives have been confiscated from the population. More than 60,000 people have been detained for committing crimes or violating the curfew. On 41 occasions arms were used.

Who serves in the Internal Troops? This question worries many people today, especially in the regions where subunits are stationed to maintain order. All kinds of rumors are circulating. It is claimed that people who grew up in children's homes and criminals who know no mercy or charity are especially enlisted in the units. And recently an absolutely absurd story was launched in Georgia. It alleged that soldiers from the Chernobyl zone whose days are numbered are being dispatched to the republic and they are likely to take out their misfortune on the local population. To clarify—the same sort of guys as in other troop categories serve in the Internal Troops, people drafted for active service and officers after graduation. Up to 25 percent of recruits are doing their service in the areas where they were born.

Today internal troops are needed in regions where the situation is particularly tense. No matter how sad this may be, there is no getting away from it.

## Ministry Official MVD Troops Anniversary

*LD2110143389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Oct 89*

[Excerpts] The Political Directorate of the internal troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is 70 years old today. Our correspondent, Tatyana Chemodanova, invited Major General (Anatoliy Ivanovich Kirilyuk), deputy chief of the directorate, to the microphone. [passage omitted]

[Chemodanova] How have the tasks of the political organs, the tasks of the internal troops, been transformed at the present time?

[(Kirilyuk)] Those tasks the country faces, our political organs face, too. As you know, the very complicated task of maintaining public order has come to the fore now in different regions of the country.

[Chemodanova] The number of internal troops are to be increased. In what connection?

[(Kirilyuk)] This was the decision made by the USSR Supreme Soviet, as you know, decisively to intensify the struggle against crime, since internal functions are not carried out by the Armed Forces and there were far from enough of our troops. It was in this connection that this decision was made. It is based not only on the decision of the party and the government; this is a request for working people, from the masses. Hundreds of letters come in from various regions of our country, and it goes without saying that the government is obliged to take into account the requests of the population in order to insure public order there and to protect the lives and the security of people who are guilty of nothing.

[Chemodanova] What difficulties do you come up against in your work?

[(Kirilyuk)] One has to teach people to operate in such conditions. One has to provide for their actions, not only from a technical practical point of view, but also from an ideological point of view. One has to give people an understanding of these events. One has to educate them. For that reason, the tasks which the political bodies of our internal troops perform are very extensive and large-scale.

[Chemodanova] (Anatoliy Ivanovich), in the future it is proposed to pass a law on absolute authority, by which, full authority will be given to local soviets?

[(Kirilyuk)] I think this will be considered at the session of the Supreme Soviet in 1990 because locally the soviets have to decide how they are to function and what questions they are to decide. Perhaps we came up against problems this year which we had to solve in the first instance because they had not been solved locally. Now it is a secret to no one that many social and interethnic conflicts could have been avoided if the party committees had shown political flexibility and firmness in the position they adopted immediately and without delay, if they had all made decisions locally, and the main thing, if they had felt fully responsible. We would have been protected from those disorders that took place there.

### Kazakh Workers Oppose Semipalatinsk Tests

*LD2410125689 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0200 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] A meeting has been held in Karaganda at the initiative of the oblast working committee and the local section of the Navada-Semipalatinsk Movement. Among those who spoke at the meeting were its chairman, poet Olzhas Suleymenv. The miners and others who took part in the meeting made an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government, stating that it is necessary to stop nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test site and throughout the world.

On the same day [as heard] Olzhas Suleymenov met the members of the oblast working committee at the Karaganda City Executive Committee. He informed them about the work for peace by the Nevada-Semipalitinsk Movement. The representatives of the working committee said that the continuing explosions at the Semipalatinsk test site pose a serious threat to the health of the population in nearby localities. It was stated that it is planned to hold a 2- hour warning strike in Karaganda against plans for a new nuclear test. A telegram regarding this matter has been sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

### Estonian Official on Opposition to New Laws

*90UN0033A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 5 Oct 89 pp 1-2*

[Report on interview with Ayn Soydla, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR), by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondent S. Volkov: "Economically Accountable Estonia"; date and occasion not specified]

[Text] Republic economic accountability is not the most exact term for those complex processes which occur today in Estonia. Here the abbreviation IME is used to represent the first letters that denote the concept of a "Self-Managing Estonia." IME is a composite of economic, social, political, and other measures, whose implementation, according to the plan of ideologists of perestroyka in Estonia, could lead the republic out of stagnation and set an example for others. It follows that an economically accountable Estonia and economic accountability in Estonia, and especially republic economic accountability, are by no means synonymous concepts...

The concept of an economically accountable Estonia is discussed by S. Volkov, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondent, and Ayn Soydla, the first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Estonian SSR.

Note: Ayn Soydla, 49 years old, educated in the humanities, was a candidate of philosophical sciences. She held a number of responsible posts on the republic's party staff and worked in the CPSU Central Committee. Before being appointed first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Estonian SSR, she supervised the organization-party work department of the Central Committee of the KPE [Communist Party of Estonia].

At a recent plenum of the Central Committee of the KPE and at meetings of the secretaries of primary party organizations, a lot was said about the fact that the Russian-speaking population was poorly informed on IME questions. As the saying goes, things are more discernible on the spot, but out of numerous conversations with workers, engineers, and some managers of Interdvizheniye [Intermovement], the Republic Strike Committee Council, and the United Council of Worker Collectives of Estonia, who undertook to represent the interests of the Russian-speaking population, I came away with the conviction that there weren't any know-nothings among them. However, they interpret some of IME's positions differently from that of officials and leaders of the People's Front.

[Soydla] At first, there really was not enough information. What is the reason? I had occasion to hear about the fact that when the past began to be reinterpreted there was open talk about Stalin's repressions, and the opinion prevailed that, they said, it was indiscreet vis-a-vis the Russians to publicize all of this information. The Russian-speaking population in some measure found itself isolated from developing social thought. But when new attitudes surfaced on the streets in the form of speeches, slogans, and placards, many people were taken unawares, and they could not comprehend what was happening. Hence the fear and distrust of any measures of the republic authorities. Leaders of informal organizations did not fail to take advantage of this...

[Volkov] You believe that this flaw has been eliminated and that an open dialogue is taking place with the Russian-speaking population? Then how is this fact explained: On 18 August 1989, E. Savisar, chairman of the republic's Gosplan [State Planning Committee] sent a letter to the Union Gosplan that described the procedures for transferring enterprises of Union subordination to the jurisdiction of the republic, and even the dates are mentioned in it. But the collectives of these enterprises did not know anything about the letter. It was also concealed from the leaders of informal movements. Naturally, a burst of indignation followed. What is this, a typical "slip" of the bureaucratic machine, or an attempt to resolve one of today's most critical questions privately?

[Soydla] The letter does not talk about the transfer of enterprises, but only about the preparation for it. A lot of "theoretical" work has to be accomplished for the transfer. Was it necessary to involve the entire population of the republic at a particular moment? I do not believe so.

Unfortunately, the leaders of Intermovement, the strike council, the United Council of Work Collectives of Estonia, and the Council of War Veterans and Soldier-Internationalists that joined them, sometimes do not take the trouble to give precise arguments in their speeches that effectively arouse the public. For example, M. Lysenko, chairman of the republic strike committee, said that the Law on Elections automatically deprives more than 100,000 persons of their voting rights. Where did these figures come from? According to official statistics, the number of persons registered in the republic in the past year and those who will register today amounts to about 20,000 persons. This figure also includes children and minors. They also fall in the zone of residential qualification.

[Volkov] But M. Lysenko also named sailors who are temporarily registered on their ships, and former builders of the Olympic Sailing Center who were invited into the republic, and who were promised that they would be given apartments in a short time. Alas, many of them still have only a temporary residence registration, and are housed in hotels.

[Soydla] The situation with the sailors is not as dramatic as it seems. Many of them have apartments in other republics, and they do not intend to stay in Estonia forever. This also applies to those who have a temporary registration.

[Volkov] Maybe the Law on the Right to Vote was approved prematurely?

[Soydla] No, the law was necessary. If for no other reason than not to dawdle in the implementation of IME. We have undertaken another cause, and we cannot delay here. All in all, it was necessary at the beginning to adopt the Law on Citizenship. This made it possible to remove many questions from the agenda. But we were not able to adopt this and many other laws—about referendums, about migration, about the rights of ethnic minorities, etc.—until such time as the very idea of IME was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Of course, continuity exists between the Law on the Right to Vote and the Law on Citizenship. The law exists in practically all countries. To acquire citizenship, a person is obliged to make a certain effort. And the state has to be convinced that the applicant is not a rolling stone. A person who makes a claim to citizenship in principle has to possess a certain language minimum, and to know the republic. But for this, the state, in our case, the republic, of course, is obliged to create the necessary conditions for him: a system of courses, textbooks, teachers, etc.

[Volkov] Excuse me, clarification is needed. What about citizenship in the USSR?

[Soydla] I imagine that there will be dual citizenship—Estonian and USSR.

Incidentally, it is not out of place here to respond to some of our opponents who suspect the republic of separatism: We are for a strong and actively flourishing Union republic.

[Volkov] Nonetheless, how many residents of Estonia will receive its citizenship?

[Soydla] An absolute majority. If someone does not get it, then it does not matter, he will not feel like a second class citizen. For example, we introduced increments to allowances for disabled persons and benefits for women who give birth, and we eliminated the restrictions on the salaries of working pensioners, including employees. Everyone will receive these: both Estonians and people of other nationalities.

[Volkov] I would like to be more precise on certain details of the Law on the State Language. For example, lack of knowledge of Estonian deprives a person of the opportunity to occupy a specific position in the state service, and to work in the area of service. Is an element of discrimination against the Russian-speaking population not perceived in this?

[Soydla] Of course, this law protects the Estonian language, and it guarantees the development of ethnic culture. However, the law does not require knowledge of Estonian by the entire population to a man. As a private person, a citizen can resolve all of his problems in Russian, or in some other language. But in the sphere of services and medical establishments he selects his own language of intercourse. Naturally, a worker in the service area is obliged to know one and the other language. The law does not require that a truck driver or an engineer in a plant, where the majority of people speak Russian, be absolutely proficient in Estonian; however, the director of a plant should know the state language for communicating with other organizations and enterprises.

[Volkov] But, you see, this law can also be viewed as a disguised ban on a profession. Moreover, teaching in VUZ's [higher educational institutions] is basically conducted in Estonian. It would be nice to know your opinion on the proposal of the United Council of Work Collectives to open a Russian university in the republic.

[Saydlo] The Law on the State Language, of course, has caused some inconvenience for a certain element of the Russian-speaking population, but it is not difficult for a literate person to become proficient in Estonian!

The opportunity is not that bad here to study the Russian language in VUZ's, if you look at the problem without superfluous dramatization. Today, 60 percent of the specialities in republic VUZ's are taught in two languages. Of course, we cannot duplicate all specialities, and, indeed, this is pointless. The objective conditions are not present for the establishment of a Russian university: Owing to the existing VUZ's, it is not possible to do this, and there are neither the teachers nor the material base for establishing a new educational institution.

[Volkov] The IME program provides for changes in the administrative division of Estonia. Some perceive this as almost an attempt to overthrow Soviet authority: They say, they are forming volosts [districts], and already existing citizens' committees, comprised entirely of extremists, will take over there.

[Soydla] Of course, one can imagine all sorts of things... Today, the Law on Local Self-Government is being worked on. It should be adopted by one of the next sessions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet. What can be said today about the draft law? There will not be any kind of major changes in the existing administrative division. There is a proposal to introduce new units—volosts and uyezds [townships], which are more usual for the Estonians.

According to the IME concept, authority has to be transferred to the local center. Uyezds and volosts will be the recipients of this real authority. With their own budget, communal administration, services, transport, and, of course, full responsibility before the population.

[Volkov] The enterprises will also be subordinate to the volosts?

[Soydla] All of those enterprises that are necessary for the organization of the normal life of the population will be subordinate to the authority of local organs. Agreements between local authorities and enterprises will be used widely. However, the latter will enjoy complete administrative independence and all rights.

[Volkov] Including the right to go bankrupt...

[Soydla] Such a variant is also not excluded under full economic accountability. Unfortunately, a substantial part of the enterprises of Union subordination is industry's yesterday, to put it mildly. All of the basic funds, as the saying goes in Russian, are at death's door. But the work collectives, by comparison with local industry, strange as it is, were in more favorable circumstances both in material-technical support and in wages... Such conditions formed a dependency frame of mind to a certain extent, which is now a great hindrance.

However deplorable, the majority of the Russian-speaking collectives are not adopting the IME concept fully. We requested the managers of these enterprises to submit their ideas on the switch to economic accountability. Not one of them commented! You understand, of course, if a director does not want something, then under conditions of the administrative system it is very difficult to convince and to attract his subordinates to your side.

[Volkov] This means that you do not share the point of view according to which IME is rejected by the Russian-speaking population, because people see an attack on their rights and freedom in the political and economic reforms being carried out in Estonia. Perhaps the idea of a free labor force market, simpler than unemployment, is not likely to inspire anyone.

[Soydla] Of course, full economic accountability can also lead to unemployment. It first of all will affect the low-skilled workers, and also part of the white collar workers, of whom there are a lot now in the managerial apparatus. I do not think that unemployment will affect the mass of people and leave them without a subsistence means. Some will have to retrain. All of the conditions for this will be created. We must work with high quality, if we want to live well.

Of course, the work collectives themselves will establish the number of workers and the composition of qualifications.

[Volkov] You, as I know, are planning to reprofile enterprises of Union subordination. But public opinion in the Russian-speaking community is still not disposed to this measure. The main objection is caused by that provision of the IME which states that if All-Union laws, which regulate the economy, contradict the principles of republic economic accountability and hinder it, then the laws of Estonia must operate at economically accountable enterprises. However, the Republic Council of Strike Committees insists firmly that the interests of the workers that derive from All-Union laws be taken into full account in the shift to economic accountability. How is this contradiction being overcome?

[Soydlo] Negotiations with the strike committees are proceeding with difficulty, but, nonetheless, it is possible to approach a compromise on individual points. Obviously, time and patience will put everything in place. But it is absolutely clear even today that only economically accountable enterprises capable of covering their own expenditures from their own resources can exist in an economically accountable republic. If an enterprise can barely make ends meet, or is unprofitable, then the work collective has the right to raise the question about its reprofiling. I also do not think that it is necessary that this right is deprived at first by the government, which knows the capabilities and the requirements of the republic better. But, in any case, the decision should be made taking the opinion of the collective into account.

[Volkov] In this interview we continuously run into a knowledge gap. There is no complete clarity on whatever question we raise: There is a shortage of legislative acts, without which it is difficult to give comprehensive answers about the IME program. It seemed to me that there is more propaganda around an economically accountable Estonia than specific work, and policy clearly prevails over economics. What is being done for the specific implementation of the IME program.

[Volkov] Twenty work groups have been formed in the republic that should submit draft basic laws in September-October for review by the Estonian Supreme Soviet. Of course, it would be better to have had all of the acts back in March, but we were awaiting approval of the program in principle by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Starting in January 1990 we are switching to economic accountability; there is no other way.

We are now in dire need of consolidating all of our forces. Previously a lot was missed along this road. There is a requirement for explanatory work in the Russian-speaking work collectives. A further confrontation will not be useful to anyone in Estonia. Practical resuts will be the biggest agitators for IME. People will begin to live better, and the debates will quiet down.

[Volkov] Thank you for the frank interview!

## Colonel Lauds Balts' Perestroyka Efforts

*LD2010131089 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 26 Aug 89 p 1*

[Reader's letter by Dnepropetrovsk Reserve Colonel Viktoras Pavlenka, CPSU member since 1945, entitled "Restructuring—Our common goal," under the rubric, "We Write To TIESA, Letters From other Republics."]

[Excerpts] In the past, Russia has forced annexation of the nations of Central Asia, Turkestan, the Caucasus, Poland, and the Baltic and has oppressed them. Finding themselves under the tsarist boot, these nations have regarded their oppressors with hatred and have struggled for freedom and national independence, by any means possible.

V. Lenin, the great humanist, did away with this national injustice immediately. Finland, the Baltic states, and Poland became sovereign and began an existence based on historical traditions.

I have had occasion to visit the Baltic twice, the first time in the summer of 1940. I have witnessed how Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia joined the USSR. The population was not taken in by this and did not desire it. They simply had to obey and face the facts. In talking with a lot of people, I came to understand that they had lived well and were sorry about the past. This was also understandable to us Russians. Every nation loves its Fatherland and treasures its freedom, unwilling to become conciliatory toward its oppressors on its own land.

During the time of the Great Fatherland War, I participated in battles on Lithuanian territory against the German fascists. The men of the 16th Lithuanian Division valiantly fought alongside the 166th Riflemen's Division, with which I was serving. We were united with the Lithuanian soldiers in one goal—destruction of the German occupiers. Following the war, I spent several years serving in Kaunas, Alytus, Jonava, and Siauliai and have also spent time in other Baltic cities. Lithuanians acted friendly toward me, however, they did not conceal, in the course of their conversations, their dreams of living independently. Moreover, we supported them in this respect.

Lithuania's residents have left an especially favorable impression on me. These are industrious, conscientious, cultured, and educated people. They did not conceal rocks on their person to use against us ordinary Soviet people. They shared their last piece of bread with us. We were charmed by their goodness and sincerity.

Stalinism has left its cruel bloody imprint on the Baltics. Those tragic events only served to strengthen the Baltics' goal of struggling for freedom. Finally, thanks to restructuring, the Baltic nations have the opportunity to obtain some democratic freedoms. Its representatives, who are true patriots, sought this at the first USSR Supreme Soviet Session. Their example is followed in the Transcaucasus, Moldavia and other republics.

It should not come as a suprise that those, or other republics, will raise a demand to observe the constitutional article granting the right of self-determination. It is unseemly to fear that and to panic, especially as was done by certain soviet deputies during the congress. They are worried: if certain strong republics leave the USSR, the Soviet Union will perish. Only conservative, limited individuals—foes of restructuring—can think like that.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia recently obtained the right to economic accountability and economic independence. I, as well as many others, are convinced that before long, life will become brighter in these republics, people shall live better, happily and joyously. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are the pioneers in the Soviet Union of principal social and national restructuring.

Restructuring should be a vital concern for all of us. Are we all sufficiently prepared and mature enough for new, great undertakings, however? That is why one should not be astounded by the fact that here, just as at the front lines, there are those, sometimes, who have broken through and have forged ahead. However, those who have fallen further behind the others face additional dangers. Some of them may even be in mortal danger.

This should not be forgotten in restructuring, just as it can not be forgotten at the front lines. I do not write this as an instructor, but rather as an experienced individual who lives far from Lithuania and is a sincere friend wishing it well.

The activity of the Baltic nations and their intelligent, brave party and government leaders is directed toward a fundamental change in the life of all its population strata; it is a good example, that merits respect.

Dnepropetrovsk

## Opposing Views Aired at Nationalities Roundtable

*18300827a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 16 Sep 89 p 4*

[Roundt able discussion conducted and recorded by V. Tsybulskiy: "In Search of Balance"]

[Text] **Analyzing the tendencies and directions of the forces in the sphere of ethnic relations one can see two mutually exclusive paths. The first is the strengthening of unity and actions based on centripetal forces that are intended to preserve, update, and restructure the union. The second path promotes separatist, centrifugal forces that have become more active recently and leads to disintegration and destruction of the union and the breakdown of the multinational state into ethnic segments.**

**What must we do to nullify the aspirations of the centrifugal forces and preserve our unity? This is examined by participants in today's roundtable discussion as they analyze the draft of the CPSU platform "The Party Ethnic Policy Under Modern Conditions." The participants include E. Tadevosyan, doctor of philosophical sciences; M. Guboglo, doctor of historical sciences; E. Chamokova, candidate of philosophical sciences; O. Redzhepova, candidate of philosophical sciences; M. Iordan, doctor of philosophical sciences; A. Cherezov, candidate of philosophical sciences; N. Mayevskaya, candidate of philosophical sciences; and V. Semenov, candidate of philosophical sciences.**

E. Tadevosyan: I should like to begin with a general description of the party document under discussion and take note of two aspects that determine its essence: The draft of the CPSU platform on ethnic policy is an example of the application of new thinking to the sphere of ethnic relations, and, second, it demonstrates a return to an authentically Leninist approach to the analysis of the aggravated ethnic issue. The document restores historical truth in this area and gives realistic assessments both of our achievements in ethnic policy and our mistakes. The Leninist understanding and the dialectical approach to ethnic and interethnic problems in the area of the ethnic issue are being restored.

The distortion and incorrect interpretation of these approaches have led to mistakes in the nationalities policy. The national [policy] has been regarded as anti-internationalist, as its absolute opposite, as an anachronism which should be eliminated as quickly as possible. Hence the orientation toward artificially accelerated rapprochement of nations, toward a leveling of the national [policy]. The interethnic has been regarded as nonethnic and the opposite of ethnic.

The document eradicates these mistakes. The Marxist understanding of that which lies at the basis of improvement of ethnic relations is restored and the level of democratization of social life should be included in the development of a rational ethnic policy. This is the main, all-pervasive thought, the basis for the development of a realistic, long-range ethnic policy. I think the aspects that have been noted can also be the point of departure for our discussion of the relationship between centripetal and centrifugal forces in the ethnic question today and in the analysis of the situation and our suggestions and predictions.

O. Redzhepova: I support the idea that the application of principles of new thinking to the ethnic policy, which was noted in the draft CPSU platform, has a quite special meaning. In fact our country is like a model of the multinational world. The ethnic policy in this country should take in all that is valuable for the experience of international relations in human civilization and, naturally, those principles of the new thinking in international policy which have essentially changed the picture of the world in such a short period of time.

What is the relationship between centripetal and centrifugal forces in our multinational country today? The struggle between them is so fierce that the future of the union is seriously in question. In order to determine the interaction and the relationship of these forces and approach any kind of serious prognosis for tomorrow, let us try to look at ourselves as though from the outside.

What picture do we see if we try to take an inventory, say, of forces contributing to the unification and strengthening of the union and forces directed toward its destruction? Which do we include among the centripetal forces?

Within the USSR these are economic and cultural ties that have developed over the decades: the joint historical experience and the undoubted advantages of unification and integration of the economy into a single state with a democratic structure. Among the consolidating and uniting political forces one should include first and foremost the CPSU with its experience and its initial basic ideas of internationalism.

Which forces today can objectively be directed toward shattering the unity of the union? First of all our society's overall economic and social crisis. For if a society cannot offer its citizens of various nationalities a certain standard of living that is close to world standards and conditions for preserving national attributes and values, this strengthens the desire for national self-protection and ultimately contributes to the centrifugal forces in a multinational state. Here one should include the strengthening of group interests under the conditions of democratization; that is, under conditions of granting freedom to defend these group interests. This is a general process and it does not pertain solely to groups that are joined together by a common nationality.

The ethnic mosaic of our union... With all the traditions and ties the ethnic cultures of the people populating the USSR differ strongly from one another. The formation of a new national intelligentsia, its progressive interest in the historical past of the peoples, and the increased attention of youth to these issues under certain conditions can also play the role of a centrifugal force.

In general the division of forces in the national sphere into centripetal and centrifugal is arbitrary. Depending on the overall political, economic, and social situation the same factors can act both as forces that strengthen the union and forces directed toward subverting this unity. The success of perestroyka and glasnost can also repeat the experience of the October Revolution which consolidated the peoples. With a slowing up and spinning of wheels on this path the centrifugal tendencies may become stronger.

M. Guboglo: Let us try to turn to the reserves for improving the draft platform concerning the nationalities issue precisely on the plane of resolving existing contradictions and shifting the balance of forces in the direction of centripetal forces that unite and strengthen the union.

One should note a contradiction that exists in the draft: On the one hand it asserts that the specific area of national policy is the development of nations, and on the other, at the same time all peoples should be equal. The assertion that only nations are the subject of national policy more or less determines their advantage and places in an unequal position entities that are not nations: nationalities and national groups. Then how does one provide for equal rights of peoples? I am not even speaking about the subjective aspect which is present in attempts to define the nation. A million Estonians, for example, is a nation and has the right to sovereignty, statehood, and the development of national culture, but 2 million Germans are not a nation and therefore can have none of these things.

I suppose that this contradiction is the result of some nation-centered direction and protection of the priority of the nation. What can this lead to? Take the platforms of the peoples fronts of the Baltic area, take that passion-inciting determination that the Estonian nation on its ancient territory has a priority right to realize its own ethnic and national values and culture... Until we establish the priority of the nation and not the equality of all peoples we shall be threatened by impasses like this.

Where is the solution? In any event human rights should lie at the basis of interethnic relations and the construction of our state. The relationship between human rights and the rights of peoples is taken into account in the platform. But, in my opinion, this should be stated more definitely—**in its national policy the party proceeds from the priority of human rights.**

The hierarchy of rights in a democratic state can be represented in the form of a triangle. At its base are human rights, then come the rights of minorities (in world practice the essence of the national question amounts to protection of the rights of national minorities and our own practice convinces us that the instability of the national situation is generated precisely by encroachment on the rights of minorities), and then come the rights of nations and their equality. Then there is a basis for proclaiming the equality of nations and the achievement of stability. But in the draft this triangle is turned upside-down and is standing on its point—the rights of nations—and hence the shakiness of the entire concept. The triangle must be turned right side up with human rights at its base.

In essence if this were done the entire concept would become more stable and certain contradictions would be removed. For example, the underdevelopment in the analysis of the causes of the current condition of the national problem. One speaks of distortions of the command-administrative system in this sphere, about the deportation of peoples, and about the smaller peoples who suffered from Stalinism... All this is correct and the national question has been aggravated, for reasons that include injustices against small peoples. Well what about the kulak expropriation, the forced collectivization, and the famine of 1933 that struck millions of Russians and Ukrainians? The priority of nations in the national issue again does not enable us to see the underlying cause of the people's troubles. And it is a fact that the Stalinist system rejected human rights and in general did not take them into account in the hierarchy of rights in the state. And, operating on the basis of this system, it brought harm to all nations and deprived them of their rights and equality. Both small and large ones. Having recognized this, we shall be able to correctly construct the concept of the present and future national policy in the country.

M. Iordan: From my viewpoint the USSR as a formal structure represents a certain contradictorily dualistic system. This multinational formation can be defined as a unity of a federative state (in which the republics are constituent parts) and a federation of states (union republics, where each is an individual comember). In other words, the USSR is a unified union state and at the same time a union of states (republics). From the standpoint of dialectics there is nothing strange in this interpretation. The question is how to combine the apparently incompatible constituent parts of this duality. That is, the argument that centers around which formula should be given preference in the restructuring of the union—"strong center-strong republics" or "strong republics-strong center" essentially has no meaning and reflects the mutual one-sidedness of both approaches.

The question arises: How does one resolve the contradiction between the tendencies, on the one hand, toward federalization and democratization and, on the other, toward centralization and integration? It can be resolved in such a way that in the end we shall have strengthening and growth of unity and it can turn out that we have a breakup of the union. If we select the positive constructive path for resolving the contradiction, the union will become stronger, and if we select the negative destructive one it will fall apart.

The constructive path, the path toward strengthening the union, lies in striving for mutual penetration of the sides of the aforementioned duality. This is the path of removing the oppositions, right down to changing the "plus signs"—transforming the federated state into a fully national democratic one, and the federation of states into an organ for the most effective self-government of the peoples. In strengthening the union, reliance is placed on centripetal forces, particularly the factor of significant integration of the economies of the republics into a unionwide economic structure, and on traditions of the internationalism of the working class.

Generally about certain possibilities of weakening centrifugal tendencies along state-political lines: Taking into account the growing confrontation in a number of republics between the indigenous population and those who speak a different language and the strengthening of the interethnic tendency, apparently there would be some point in creating a congress of peoples of the country without counterpoising it to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. In this forum it would be possible, on the basis of compromise and true consensus, to develop an acceptable formula for resolving interethnic conflicts. Incidentally, if one is to speak of ideological-theoretical support for the question of resolving these conflicts, apparently there is now a need to single out an area of conflictology in interethnic relations.

Along the line of socioeconomic development. The activation of nationalistic tendencies, regardless of how we classify them, is basically brought about by distorted relations between the center and the republics. Their growth does not reflect a denial of the possibility of internationalism of the center. It is a protest against pseudointernationalism, national nihilism, and ignoring national specifics. The impossibility of the republics' solving internationalist state problems in their own way, taking national uniqueness into account—in Estonia, say, "the Estonian way"; in the Ukraine, in "the Ukrainian way"; and so forth—creates favorable soil for continuing interethnic tension. One must assume that accounting for nationalist peculiarities in solving internationalist problems will make it possible to ease this tension.

And the last thing is the question of the rights of the republic party organizations. This aspect could be strengthened in the platform. It should be emphasized that the party should act in keeping with principles of democratic centralism and renewed internationalism. The unity of the CPSU strategy should not end up as the same kinds of tactics for the communist parties of the republics. As constituent parts of the CPSU they should be granted complete freedom in tactical implementation of the general party strategic course.

V. Semenov: It seems to me that when analyzing the legacy in the national sphere which has come down to us we have not yet gotten down to the causes of the current national movements and separatist aspirations. We should at least briefly determine what the society we have created is. When speaking of the fact that the cause of the aggravation of the national issue lies in the distortions in various spheres, we are approaching only the essence of the first order. And in spite of Leninist methodology we are not digging down to the essence of deeper orders. With this kind of analysis it would be correct to take into account Lenin's description of the age of disintegration of feudalism which he linked directly to national movements. Such an analogy would help us determine the main cause of the aggravation of national relations if we have been able to characterize the form of socialism at which we have arrived.

If we look at the entire historical-logical scheme of the construction of our state, we come to the conclusion that the kind of socialism constructed during the Stalinist period was that which Marx and Engels characterized as feudal in the Communist Party Manifesto.

The basic features of feudal socialism are generally defined in the commentary and statements of scholars. It is complete state ownership of all the productive forces and social wealth. Hence, as in a feudal society, all work is transformed into compulsory militarized labor. Further, in 1917 a decision was made for complete elimination of the privileges of social and civil service rank. Stalin managed to restore all this and the society was again divided up according to the cast-class principle. And there is another feature of the feudal-socialist society that is related to the ideological sphere. Marxist-Leninist ideology was supplanted by a Stalinist interpretation of it which replaced the religious consciousness. Any doubt or denial of this ideology led to the physical destruction of a person with different ideas or to one or another form of suppression. It seems to me that such an analysis is closer to the essence of those contradictions which we are seeing in the society today, including those in the sphere of ethnic relations. In one brief form or another these ideas could be reflected in the analytical part of the platform, all this could be discussed at the plenum, and the role of the party could be self-critically evaluated in all of these processes.

In my view the provisions of the draft concerning the relationship between union and republic rights also need more in-depth development. The draft discusses granting greater rights to the republics and it sounds as though someone could turn over these rights, which means that they must also take them away. It seems to me that all this should be the opposite—the republics themselves and the peoples themselves must decide which rights they will delegate to the center.

We have not yet penetrated deeply enough into Lenin's ideas from the twenties, particularly one that was included in one of his last works, "Toward the Question of Nationalities and on 'Autonomization'." In this work one can see the prospects for democratization of federal-national relations. On 31 December 1922 at the time when the decision was made to form the USSR, Lenin noted that it might be necessary to return to the question of the union and to give the republic people's commissariats complete independence, leaving the center with only union functions—diplomatic and military. The authority and unity of the party should serve as a guarantee against separation of the republics. In essence this was an anticipation of our situation in which we have been forced to change over from an ultra-centralized, unitary system which essentially denies democratic relations to a restored socialist federation.

E. Tadevosyan: I would just warn you of the danger of incorrectly applying the situation of the twenties—when Lenin wrote his remarks when the union was just being formed and when it was necessary to overcome the mistrust of the center and everything Russian and to test out various variants—to today's situation and to ignore the more than 60 years of experience with relations that exist within the union.

And I should like to note another thing: The national issue is a question not only of our attitude toward the fate of nations and nationalities, but also of a mandatory solution to the problem of national minorities. And here today we are taking a significant step forward, devoting constant attention to problems of national minorities. The merit of the draft of the platform is that, without equating various aspects of the national issue, it proceeds from the principle of sovereignty and free self-determination both for all peoples and nationalities and, in a different form, for ethnic groups that are living together in close proximity.

Of course, everything begins with human rights. This is indisputable. But these rights must be insured with a national policy that is based on legislative reinforcement of the rights of peoples.

E. Chamokova: When we speak of human rights it seems to me that we are not taking into account the fact that there is no human being outside the social community. I agree that the guarantee of human rights is the foundation, the basis of everything. But nonetheless there are specific features to the solution of the problem of peoples that are not expressed by the general provisions on human rights. Therefore the declaration of the rights of peoples, which is based on the declaration of human rights, is still necessary.

Each ethnic group has its own problems whose solutions depend also on the adoption of laws pertaining to these ethnic characteristics. The main one of these is the law on the land. A distortion of the national policy in this issue means more than the deportation of minor peoples. It means also, for example, the resettlement of mountain people in valleys, which is supposedly for their own good but actually destroys their ethnic distinctions, their culture... And we must understand that we are not stabilizing the national situation unless we solve the land question on this plane in the near future.

The draft of the platform points out specifically the peoples who were treated unjustly during Stalinist times and which national problems must be solved first. In such a general, basic document such a detailed account does not serve any purpose. But it is clear that unless situations of conflict are resolved and justice is restored the national situation cannot be stabilized, which means that the party platform cannot be realized. I think that the plenum should name all the hotbeds of national tension and all the peoples whose sociocultural existence is threatened as a result of various mistakes and crimes, including the problems of the Chechen-Akkins and Ingushes.

And violations that can be corrected fairly quickly must be corrected directly at the plenum and at the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. For it has reached a point where recently I witnessed the first secretary of the Novolaksiy party raykom [rayon committee] as he read to the party aktiv an ukase from 7 March 1944 according to which Chechen-Akkins were removed from their land as though that ukase were in effect today. And although they were imperfect, the ukases of the fifties abolished the ukase of 1944. The Chechen-Akkins were rehabilitated. So at the plenum let us announce the need for unwavering enforcement legal acts that restore justice in regard to peoples who have suffered.

The document speaks of the fate of minor peoples of the North and Siberia. But the peoples of the Northern Caucasus and the Pamir? And other minor and major peoples who have been deprived of statehood and ended up in a position in which it is difficult to defend their rights? The question of national policy is above all a question of the rights of national minorities. And not just on a general theoretical or conceptual plane. Theory should be confirmed by concrete programs for the development of various peoples whose sociocultural destiny has been threatened.

N. Mayevskaya: The lack of solutions to problems of spiritual life can become a catalyst for situations of conflict. But still the basis of interethnic crises is most frequently the bad situation in the sociopolitical and economic spheres. Therefore first of all it is still necessary to work on solving socioeconomic problems in order to make the life of the peoples in our country more attractive. The people should be able to see real ways out of the situation that has been created precisely within the framework of the union.

Why in statements about social and political things are people frequently joined together according to national and ethnic indicators? Each individual enters into the closest contacts with bearers of historical experience, national character, moral values, and national psychology similar to his own. It is in terms of these indicators that a united part of the society which is historically and ethnically close to a certain subject is the referent group in which ties with the society are most fully realized. It is in interaction with a part of the society (one's nation, one's nationality) formed this way that a person most frequently stands up to defend common interests.

The events in Ordzhonikidze at the beginning of the eighties were interpreted as nationalist uprisings. And they were sociopolitical and economic in nature and in this sense were related to many subsequent national conflicts. The people were speaking out against corruption in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the organs of justice, and the administrative-management apparatus. As a result of a cruel and thoughtless policy the interests of the Osetian and Ingush people came into conflict in a small piece of land and to this day each of these peoples is trying to prove that it has a preferential right to the land and the means of making a living. This leads to increased nationalistic awareness and aspirations.

The draft of the CPSU platform on national policy, in spite of shortcomings both in the evaluation of the present state of affairs and in prospects for the development of the peoples (this is largely conditioned by the inadequate development of these issues in science), is undoubtedly a step in the direction of humanization of interethnic relations.

I should like to speak separately about such a concept as the level of development of the people and the nation. Apparently we are speaking about the level of development of each individual nation in a community with other peoples, but taking into account the specifically national and ethnic. In both our evaluations and our recommendations we should take into account the individual level of development inherent in each nation. Following the Baltic model, or the Central Asian model, or the Caucasian model. We have not yet determined the precise criteria for the level of development of one or another nation in the union or republic, but we can already say for certain that it is impossible and unnecessary to develop and determine a single model. And if the Baltic republics require a great deal of economic and political independence, for small peoples of the North this can be fatal.

A. Cherezov: When discussing questions of the future of our union we must correlate our conclusions with the common systemic laws of development. The general rule of movement is autonomization of the parts in the process of the development of the system. Partial separation is a powerful level for management and a condition for development. The essence of this tendency is that when they are divided the subsystems have to be added on to management agencies which previously, with strict centralization, were not necessary. With greater freedom one must solve more problems. Instead of one head thinking for all, there is a need for many heads. We are faced with the need to change over from a unified center of management, which is not capable of coping with the growing flow of problems and tasks, to a decentralized method of management—a distributed brain. By analogy with a computer, one can say that such a class of systems is more progressive.

The analogy of redistribution of authority in the systems of center-republic and ministry-enterprise is obvious. If this change had been made 20-30 years ago, today we would have neither the crisis in the economy nor the tension in interethnic relations, at least not in the extreme manifestations with which we are dealing today.

History has its own laws. The construction of a new state after 1917 from the standpoint of centralization of authority meant a return to the past. Under the monarchy Russia was a centralized country. The incipient capitalism took the first steps toward decentralization of management. The development of the new state inevitably proceeded along the line of strict centralization. That is, we moved from a certain level of evolutionary development to a different, lower one. The Leninist NEP [New Economic Policy] was capable of invigorating the economy and saturating the market with goods and it was not a step backward, not a temporary deviation from the path of development, but a step forward. It was a return to the stage of progress from which we departed during the time of war communism.

The principles of a system approach to development show that we should not hamper the republics from moving in the directions that attract them, but help them in this from the center. If all are pulling in one direction—in this case in the direction of decentralization of management and rapprochement with the world community, which is advantageous to all—there will be no reasons for withdrawing from the union. On the contrary, there will be a tendency toward coming together—it is easier to carry out the restructuring together.

Decentralization as a law of development is dialectically combined with association. But this is a new kind of association. The independent units are subjects of management. Moreover, the development of the whole, in which the parts have no independence, has a limit. Further development of the whole is possible only when its parts are formed and are given independence—when they become subjects of management. The inertia of the whole is great. And it is easier for its autonomous parts to conduct various maneuvers, which, incidentally, is confirmed by the experience of several years of perestroyka and progressive processes in the republics that have entered on this path.

The problems of interrelations of cultures in the union are complex. And it seems to me that the leaders of radical groups who advance the slogan of secession of one republic or another from the union as a means of retaining their national culture at best fails to show an awareness of the consequences, which can be directly opposed to the proclaimed goals. Far from every national culture is capable of surviving when it comes into contact with world culture. Proceeding toward direct communication with world culture a nation is frequently simply not able to retain all of its national features. Therefore the common task of all the peoples of the republics is to understand that it is precisely as a part of a renewed union that optimal conditions will be created for them to come closer to the world culture while at the same time retaining their own national culture.

O. Redzhepova. This is what I should like to say in conclusion. Under various conditions the balance of the centripetal and centrifugal forces can develop in different ways. Objectively it is possible to have situations in one region or another where the balance of these forces turns out to be in favor of retaining the unity of the union. In this case efforts are needed in order to change the relationship. Which path is the most productive here? Mutual compromises are necessary to resolve national contradictions and both the republics and the center should be prepared for this. The bases for such approaches lie in the draft of the CPSU platform. And the second thing is that there must be maximum responsibility of each people, of each Soviet person in the area of interethnic relations and the awareness that not only the fate of perestroyka, but perhaps also of the whole world depends on us.

For national problems and their aggravation in a country like the USSR can have global consequences and even lead to the destabilization of the entire world political system. Under these conditions irresponsible actions in the sphere of interethnic relations, regardless of which side undertakes them, threaten the fragile balance of the entire world. Such today is the price of the responsibility of the Soviet peoples and each citizen for his position and actions.

## Adoption of Social Democracy Ideas Urged

*PM1110143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3*

[Article by USSR People's Deputy S. Alekseyev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Questions of Theory: Debating Platform": "Panhuman Values and Socialism"]

[Text] A debate on socialism has developed on the pages of PRAVDA. But the question arises: Is this the time, under conditions when our economy and other spheres of society have been afflicted by a serious crisis, to discuss socialism, its new appearance, and the ideals and principles of democratic humane socialism? Please God, as they say, that we may rapidly cope with the troubles and difficulties which have somehow simultaneously descended on our country.

The time. It is the very best time!

Because, first, it is precisely now that we must give an honest and direct reply to the question: Are the negative facts of our reality the product of socialist-building or are we faced with processes of a different kind which have nothing to do with socialism?

Second, it is precisely now that we should record the inconsistency or even the most total bankruptcy of a number of directions of the development of society concealed by the phraseology of socialism and see—however surprising it may seem—the bright elements which are emerging in real life and which have made socialism the age-old dream of working people.

And, third and finally, it is precisely now, with the acute need to rapidly overcome the present difficulties, that we must not be deflected from the main path, that we must, in resolving any problem, check how far the measures which are being taken conform with socialist ideals and principles so that, while overcoming difficulties and troubles, we do not lose sight of the long term.

Now a question which has just been mentioned. A question which from the philosophical viewpoint is a central, key one. Is it possible to regard as socialism all those realities, all the multifaceted activity, which surrounds us and in which we are living?

A simple answer of yes or no will not be appropriate here. Both yes and no are more in keeping here.

Yes—because as a result of October and the first steps of Lenin's new economic policy era, the initial positions—the economic, political, and ideological foundations of socialism—were won and society was firmly "disposed" toward excluding man's exploitation of man from social life, toward asserting real social protection for working people. And in general, despite all the complexities of subsequent development, these principles of democratic, humane socialism have in one way or another exerted and continue to exert beneficial influence on our complex reality.

No—because during the years of the civil war and even more from the late twenties left-communist orientations prevailed in ideology and practice right up to 1985 and an economy of the war-communism type was established and imperious administrative methods of management prevailed. Justified to some extent under conditions of war, these avenues and methods acquired dominant significance in the life of Soviet society and brought to life phenomena and orders which were essentially organically alien to socialism (the global statification of social life, mass repressions, the hierarchical-edict style of leadership, the working people's removal from ownership and from political power). All this is the most immediate source of the negative factors and realities of the present day.

That is why it may be asserted with complete justification that these facts and realities which, alas, are in many respects preserved to this day, are not the product of socialism. They are the result of that period of development, mainly war-communism development, development of the barracks type, a period which is concealed by the phraseology of socialism but has nothing to do with socialism. From this it follows, apart from everything else, that the formulas adopted previously concerning the victory of socialism—"basically" in Stalin's time—and especially concerning "the complete and definitive" victory of socialism and the assertion of developed socialism—at a later period—are devoid of any serious meaning.

What then distinguishes the war-communism, barracks period of society's development from the socialism which by its nature can only be a democratic, humane system "with a human face?" Are there only phenomena like the global statification of social life, mass repressions, the GULAG, the priority of coercion and violence in the state's mutual relations with the individual?

In our discussions about socialism we often restrict ourselves in general to a positive reply to the question: We will do away with the violation of legality, we will ensure the full power of the soviets, we will attach chief importance to economic methods and to the law—and everything will be in order, that's socialism for you.

No, not everything is in order. The most important and decisive thing in socialism has not been "grasped" here. This most important and decisive thing is to continue the logic, the natural line of development which stems from the initial positions of socialism won by October and which under the conditions of the New Economic Policy was expressed in V.I. Lenin's famous words about the change in our entire view of socialism (a change, it must be noted, by comparison with the war-communism systems of the civil war). If we recall here Lenin's ideas about socialism as a system of civilized cooperative members, about the need to use the achievements of the culture of preceding eras, about the use of West European legislation in the interests of the working people, and other ideas, then in my view the line of October is a line toward putting panhuman values—the values of civilization—at the service of man, his lofty position in society, and his happiness.

From this viewpoint it can hardly be recognized as adequate that, in elucidating humane, democratic socialism we should restrict ourselves merely to indicating that this is a democratic system which wholly serves man. Declarations of this kind are worth little on their own. It is necessary for man and his interests and happiness to be served by institutions and regulating mechanisms of society which have taken shape as a result of the development of civilization and which are panhuman values. Here we should include among panhuman values not only the achievements of spiritual culture and morality but above all phenomena of the economy and social life (ownership, commodity-market production, law, self management, and others). And institutions and regulating mechanisms of this kind can function according to their own laws, often in contradiction with proclaimed declarations.

After all, the institutions of civilization, formed in the process of mankind's laborious journey, in his interaction with the environment and in his contradictory self development, are panhuman values—subtle and very complex regulating systems expressing the dignity of mankind as the supreme sphere of the universe in terms of level of development. Well, they contain a lot which bears the imprint of the past—the imprint of the negative aspects of private ownership, of haphazardness, of class antagonisms, of the rule of the affluent, and so forth. But at the same time they are the carriers of profound panhuman principles, of culture, of polished social regulating instruments perfected over the centuries. And without them, without ownership, commodity production, law, self management, and morality being directed toward serving people and above all working people, the social system, however much we may publicize it, cannot fundamentally serve mankind wholly. And I think that the organic sin of that period in our society's development characterized by a war-communism, barracks system consists in the fact that it essentially broke with panhuman values and the achievements of human civilization and set itself against the entire past, conceived its own myths, and advertized its own forms as forms in which everything was "the other way round," "qualitatively opposite" to all other forms known to human history, and so forth.

Thus, if we try to characterize socialism in an extremely brief formula from the positions under examination we may perhaps put it like this: **socialism is a social system born of October in which panhuman values and the achievements of civilization are placed at the service of man, his lofty position in society, and his happiness.**

With this approach toward socialism and its ideals and principles we will have to part with a number of ossified dogmas, overcome stereotypes and renounce the bad, overideologized view of ownership and owners, of commodity production and profit, and of "extraclass" morality and moral behests.

The point merely is to cut off from the historically formed institutions and regulating mechanisms of civilization those aspects and manifestations which are connected with private-ownership, exploitative stages of human history, to discover and fully reveal their panhuman, "civilized" potential. And it is socialism, which is built on a scientific world outlook and has mastered the levers of democratic power and regulation, which can fulfill this kind of purging, ennobling role.

It may confidently be asserted that institutions and revolutionary mechanisms of civilization and panhuman values purged of the burden of the exploitative past also acquire the significance of values of socialism.

Ownership, for instance. If you cut off from it everything connected with man's exploitation of man, with predatory enrichment, with greed and selfishness (and through purposeful regulation socialism is capable of achieving this), then the actual nature of ownership is decisively altered. Being a form of assimilation of natural resources and the products of labor, ownership expresses, to use Marx' words, the subjects' attitude toward these resources and products "as their own." In this capacity ownership and its manifestation (like the rights of the lessee) have no alternatives: They are adapted to safeguard panhuman interests, and provide the optimum safeguard, on the one hand, for the maintenance of constant, steady interest in the use of the objects of ownership and consequently in highly productive labor. On the other hand they produce the effect of the "burden of ownership," of responsibility in using property. Ownership in that respect is the basis and linchpin of highly productive economic management.

Or take commodity-market production again. If here, too, we eliminate the negative aspects of this economic phenomenon and its haphazard nature and its adverse influence on people's living standard (and in addition overcome the stereotype which reduces the market to mercenary mindedness, speculative machinations, and so forth) then in that case we will have before us a value of panhuman civilization.

Or, finally, take the example of the law. Of course, under the conditions of class antagonisms the existing system of legal norms expresses the will of the ruling class, but in the absence of such antagonisms the law primarily safeguards rights and places them within a specific framework—rights which are the legal opportunities of citizens and organizations laid down by the law. It is this, with the effective use of legal levers, which makes it possible not only to reliably record and protect human rights but also to regulate in a new, socialist manner, ownership relations and commodity-market relations, including through contracts, credits, and taxes. And if to this we add the operation of the norms of panhuman morality and moral behests which give priority to good, justice, compassion, charity, and philanthropy, then the implementation of ownership and market relations blocks to an even greater degree the negative aspects of those phenomena and they are directed toward satisfying man's interests and ensuring his lofty and fitting position in society.

However paradoxical it may seem, it is now, when our country is experiencing considerable difficulties in the economy and in the social sphere (in the atmosphere of renewal all the negative elements previously accumulated have surfaced), that paths for our socialist development have started to emerge tangibly.

Without touching here on the whole spectrum of problems emerging here, I shall dwell on just two of them. On those which, I am convinced, are among the primary, fundamental elements of the very basis of socialism's economic and social organization.

**The first is the direct involvement of all workers of socialist society, of all working people in relations of ownership of the means of production.** It is under present conditions that the October slogan "factories for the workers, land for the peasants," linked in the closest way with Lenin's idea of socialism as a system of civilized cooperative members, should be implemented in practice.

This should be embodied primarily in the development of the cooperative movement, in the creation and expansion of the sphere of activity of production and construction cooperatives. Now, after the USSR Supreme Soviet has put taxes on cooperatives in order on an all-union scale, these cooperatives have received a privileged status and in addition they are oriented toward the development of their own fixed capital (revenue for their development is excluded from the taxable sums).

And what, in the relationship under examination, is the fate of state assets—the main mass of the country's means of production? What here—denationalization? No, nationalization and ownership by the entire people are a very important gain and advantage of socialism. Here it is more correct to speak not of "denationalization" but of "destatification" of production assets through their transfer to the working people under the conditions of the long-term lease and the formation of people's enterprises on this basis. Under present conditions, since the USSR Supreme Soviet's approval of the decree on the lease and lease relations and the introduction of amendments to the law on the state enterprise (association), a broad road has been opened up for the transformation of state enterprises' labor collectives into organizations of lessees of state assets with their subsequent buildup of "their own" group ownership, emergence from the auspices of departments, and formation of people's enterprises on this basis. And these are enterprises which in principle operate on a cooperative basis, which with time will attest to the assertion in our country of a system of civilized cooperative members—of independent socialist commodity producers who are sovereign in terms of their assets. Here the restriction of state orders (in the future I think they will be no more than 70-80 percent of the volume of production) will create a real basis for the functioning of an effective multistructural socialist commodity-market economy geared to man and his needs and interests.

**The second is the formation of free associations of producers on the basis of cooperatives and leased organizations.** The primary structural unit of the economic and social organization predicted by K. Marx—the free association of producers—is called on to act as the owner of the means of production. And on this basis to replace the system of ineffective hired day labor (with the aid of which the state's assimilation of surplus labor is effected even in our country) with a system of free labor by producers. One important element of this replacement is **the opportunity for the real and full implementation of the socialist principle of distribution in accordance with the quantity and quality of labor.**

The most notable thing in this process is that it coincides fully, point by point, as they say, with the previously noted line toward the formation of socialist commodity-market production, whose main subjects will be cooperatives and organizations of lessees (people's enterprises). It is within the framework of production and construction cooperatives on the one hand and the organization of lessees (people's enterprises) on the other that the formation of free associations of producers—the basic cells of the social organization of democratic, human, humane socialism—is taking place in reality even now.

Does that mean that free associations of producers, now expressed in cooperatives and lessees' organizations, will fully replace state enterprises and their labor collectives? Of course not. With regard to the country's unified economic complexes—the energy, defense, transport, machine building, and metallurgical complexes and others—the state enterprses and their associations will prove essential in the future too. But, drawn into the overall system of the economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] commodity-market economy, they will change their nature, which will enable the enterprises' labor collectives to basically acquire the status of free associations of producers.

One consideration of a world-outlook nature.

In the opinion of the author of these lines, what should be foremost in the democratic renewal of our society are transformations of ownership, the involvement of producers and all working people in relations of ownership of the means of production, and the formation of free associations of producers with the aid of the cooperative movement, the lease, and the people's enterprises. On this basis political reform, the deepening of democracy, the actual implementation of the principles of the real full power of the people—everything which is related to panhuman values in the field of politics—will be further powerfully developed.

From this, apart from everything else, it follows that democracy under socialism encompasses primarily the economy and the social sphere. From this viewpoint it cannot be regarded as fortuitous that the communist movement in the lifetime of K. Marx and F. Engels and for a long time in the lifetime of V.I. Lenin developed as **social democracy**—a democracy whose point and effect depended to a decisive degree on revolutionary transformations in the very foundations of the life of society.

Only the deviations of a number of ramifications of the social democratic movement from the revolutionary paths of social development, the triumph of left-communist trends at certain stages of the revolution, the extremes of the internal party struggle and then, under Stalinism, the deliberate discrediting of democratic avenues in the communist movement lent a negative, offensive coloring to the ideas of social democracy and the actual expression "social democracy." Has the time not come now, under the conditions of perestroyka, with the creation of a humane, democratic socialism when all the achievements of civilization are being used, to adopt, in accordance with the line of October and with Lenin's ideas, the democratic panhuman values which took shape within the framework of the social democratic movement (shareholding forms of workers' participation in production, the organization of paid services, sick pay offices, and others)—the values which were not only the product of theory but also the product of practice in a number of countries? Of course, they must be adopted with a strict consideration for our Soviet conditions.

## Bogomolov Argues for Undogmatic Socialism

*PM1110110989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 p 2, 3*

[Interview with Academician Oleg Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System, under the "Forecast" rubric conducted by own observer Aleksey Novikov: "Socialism and the Nineties"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Academician Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System, has never been involved in the "scientific validation" of numerous political and economic absurdities and ventures. In 1979, when Soviet tanks entered Afghanistan, the CPSU Central Committee received a letter bearing Bogomolov's signature listing the potential catastrophic consequences of this reckless act. And it was entirely natural that Bogomolov should add yet another title—USSR People's Deputy—to his name this spring. Academician Bogomolov is today's interlocutor.

[Novikov] Oleg Timofeyevich, Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. representative at the United Nations, recently described you in an article as a "Gorbachev adviser." Is that so?

[Bogomolov] I do not, of course, belong to the circle of his immediate aides, but one of the features of Mikhail Sergeyevich's activity is that he relies extensively on the opinion of scientists and intellectuals from various fields, includes them in his delegations, and consults with them. And in that sense my colleagues and I do have the opportunity to express our standpoint and do to some extent perhaps even influence particular decisions. Moreover, our institute has the right to address directly the Politburo, the general secretary, and the chairman of the Council of Ministers. True, we do not always know whether our proposals are accepted or rejected, but we do at least know that they are read.

[Novikov] Previously readers would devour reports from capitalist countries in our newspapers, now it's the reverse: Virtually every piece of news from a socialist country is sensational, at least when Poland or Hungary is involved. What is happening here?

[Bogomolov] The whole socialist world is indeed the focus of attention today. This is primarily due to the changes in the Soviet Union, the difficulties which our country is experiencing, and the rapid process of transformations of various kinds which are at least proclaimed even if not actually being carried out. This also applies to the radical change of policy guidelines—in one year!—in countries such as Poland and Hungary.

What, then, is the situation today in the socialist camp? The crisis being experienced by the Stalinist or neo-Stalinist-type social system which was imposed on or uncritically borrowed by these countries, is a general one. This system has revealed its complete bankruptcy and inability to solve the vital tasks of developing society. This crisis has assumed an acute and open character in a number of countries and has necessitated a radical change of policy, while in others it is still latent—hidden—in nature, but the signs of it are indisputable.

How does this manifest itself? Primarily in the fact that, no matter how painful it is for us to say this, socialist countries are lagging behind the general development of mankind, standing on the sidelines of the historical process. They are lagging behind in labor productivity, the quality of goods, and technological progress. Not to mention backwardness in the sphere of international exchanges, specialization, and cooperation—here they are becoming increasingly marginalized. There is clearly a slowdown and decline in the rate of economic growth and consequent decline in living standards. The growth in social conflicts and tension, strikes, the growth of crime, disillusionment with hitherto declared values, lack of faith in the advantages of socialism, the emergence of other programs, the exacerbation of national conflicts... All these extremely disagreeable phenomena are often passed off by Western commentators as a crisis of socialism, but I think that it would be more accurate to speak of a crisis of the social system which we now call Stalinist or, I repeat, neo-Stalinist.

In short, what we have here are many common problems that force us to seek urgent solutions. We have designated this "revolutionary perestroyka," other terms may be used in other countries, but what it involves is a profound and radical reshaping of the social system. Objectively this process has come to a head everywhere, but subjectively the prerequistes for it are not present everywhere: In some places society has still not grasped the acuteness of the problems, in others the leadership does still not fully realize what needs to be done. But, in my view, this process of transformations will sooner or later encompass all the countries.

An overt and profound crisis erupted in Poland in 1980, and since then the country has been unable to extricate itself from this situation and the crisis has become long-term in character. The economic situation there is very complex, and the political situation even more difficult, in my opinion. Poland tried to find a way out of the situation and the Polish United Workers Party, using its authority, proposed a course and its own solution to problems and resorted to extreme means such as martial law. But we can see that all this failed to yield results. What is the problem, then? In my view, if you try to make the people happy without securing a nationwide approach nothing will come of it. National unity is the key question in such a situation.

In Hungary the process of transformations goes back quite a few years now. I would say that economic reform began there in 1957, when mandatory deliveries of agricultural produce were abolished and market levers and mechanisms introduced into this very important sphere of the economy. The formation of cooperatives on a voluntary basis underpinned by a market mechanism augmented this in the early sixties. And this all led to striking results: Hungary is now one of the world's leading countries in terms of agricultural productivity; it not only feeds itself but also exports a vast amount of food.

Later, in 1968, market mechanisms began to be applied to the whole economy, including industry—albeit not very consistently, with circumspection, and with retreats, but... But I do think that Hungary would be in a far worse state today if those reforms had not taken place. The quality of Hungarian goods today is nevertheless better than in other socialist countries. A market does exist, and there exists some kind of balance in that market. The money even if it is depreciating is nevertheless money and serves as as a means of purchase, and foreign trade is strongly developed. But at the same time, the foreign debt is very high and this does mar the situation.

[Novikov] One meets many hypotheses in newspaper and magazine articles devoted to Hungary and Poland regarding the results of the transformations taking place in those countries: capitalism, democratic socialism, and so forth. I appreciate that political taxonomy is not the most rewarding exercise, but as we are accustomed to pinning labels on everything, let's try to determine what these countries are "restructuring themselves" into.

[Bogomolov] For all the difficulties and the crisis of which I have spoken and the disillusionment with the experience of the past and certain ideological concepts, the idea of socialism is still alive—the idea of a fairer social system where unemployment, exploitation, and oppression are absent, where a fair system of distribution exists, and where social safeguards have a completely different significance. This socialist idea was conceived a very long time ago, perhaps at the time of early Christianity, and continues to this day. As far as Poland and Hungary are concerned, it is not only the parties which ruled there but also the so-called constructive oppositions which do not wish to abandon this idea.

Modern capitalism has changed, and pretty radically; it is no longer what we once conceived of it as. Lenin, for example, said that labor productivity was the crucial criterion of socialism. But today we see that the West has been more successful precisely in this respect. Does this mean that, if we are guided by this criterion, the system which produces greater labor productivity is more socialist? We say: Okay, labor productivity is the task for the future, we will raise it, but on the other hand we do have advantages such as public ownership and planning. But public ownership is also developing in the West today, and pretty rapidly. I am not talking just about the cooperatives which exist in a number of countries in the West and in Japan—they represent collective ownership and are playing a large role in those countries' economies. Joint-stock companies are also no longer private capital in the old sense whereby a firm belongs to a single owner who holds complete sway. Share capital is now collective capital. So that even under capitalism a process of emerging collective public ownership is under way with a corresponding superstructure and different management: Shareholders' meetings and managers' councils which make democratic decisions. Moreover, there is the increasing emergence of what can be termed in general socialist ownership—when the workers of an enterprise buy it from the owner (or the state, as in Britain) and become owners of it themselves, manage it, and share the revenue.

As for planning, here, too, the West is way ahead of us. Not a single Western firm or corporation can exist without taking sophisticated account of the market, trading conditions, and demand, planning its share of this market, and so forth. And yet our major plants in general are unable to plan in this sense. They are only able to determine their capacities and then defend their own interests in endless wrangles with superior authorities about what they can and cannot do. In Western countries, however, strategy is developed and many objectives and priorities are determined on a statewide level and then all this is purposefully carried out via a policy of bank credits and legislation.

Not to mention social safeguards: We previously sought to prove that a free medical service, education, and pensions were virtually the sole and indisputable advantage of socialism. In fact here, too, we are one of the also-rans: The populations of most Western countries today enjoy social safeguards, and these safeguards appear far more impressive than ours.

[Novikov] Interesting figures on this score were recently cited in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA by Professor Lev Lyubimov. According to him, U.S. social expenditure comes to around $1 trillion per year. Some $230-240 billion is spent annually on the education system alone and almost $115 billion on the two basic medical aid programs. "Social acquisition," he writes, "outstripped acquisition carried out on the basis of ownership of capital long ago and many times over."

[Bogomolov] Yes, we should obviously abandon the dogma that socialism can only be built on a vacant lot or on the ruins of a former system all of whose institutions—both economic and political—have been broken and "consigned to the ashcan of history." In actual fact socialism arises within preceding formations. That is why elements of socialism are already so strongly represented in the modern Western world.

[Novikov] It is appropriate to recall V. Korolenko's words here. Comparing Russian capitalism with a fortress, he wrote to Lunacharskiy: "The fortress has been taken by us and given over to wholesale pillage. You have forgotten only that this fortress is a national asset... that in this apparatus created by Russian capitalism there is much that needs improvement and further development but not destruction." And again: "The struggle against this system has taken on something of the nature of a siege of an enemy fortress. All havoc wrought on this besieged fortress, every fire started within it, and every destruction of its resources is beneficial to the besiegers. And you have also regarded all damage caused to the capitalist system as successes, forgetting that the true victory of the social revolution, if it is destined to be, will consist not in the destruction of the capitalist production apparatus but in our control and operation of it on new principles." And that, after all, was said 70 years ago!

However, let us return to today. The theory of "convergence," as it is known—the rapprochement of capitalism and socialism as they develop with the prospect of complete fusion in the future—has existed in bourgeois political science for many years. Our scientists have fervently criticized it in the past, but now, it seems to me, this theory should be examined more carefully.

[Bogomolov] Yes, the theory of "convergence" does seem far less primitive than it did before. The West today is progressing toward a higher form of society which is called a "postindustrial" or "information technology" society there, while we more often describe it as the first stage of communism or socialism. But in abandoning utopias, dogmas, and utterly primitive ideas of socialism and reviving the role of market relations we are undoubtedly returning to common human values which no longer depend on the form of social system but are in general inherent to modern man. Democracy is not the product of the development of some one system, it represents the huge gain of a civilization that has absorbed many centuries of experience, it is the form of existence of modern society, the way modern society is managed. And the fact that we are now making the transition from totalitarianism to democracy means that we are finally returning to the achievements of common human progress, many of which were foolishly jettisoned by us.

[Novikov] Incidentally, I do not doubt for a moment that if the present reforms in their present-day form had occurred in Hungary and Poland 10 years ago, they would have been unambiguously described as revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

[Bogomolov] Its seems unrealistic to me to think that Poland or Hungary after so many years of development in those forms in which they proceeded will suddenly start resorting to some Swedish or Austrian model. The first question which arises then is what to do about public ownership, which has dominated in those countries and which according to the constitution resides in the hands of society? Hand it over immediately to an individual group of entrepreneurs. I think that this is simply impossible. Public ownership will nevertheless prevail in the Hungarian and Polish economies, but not in the the dogmatic sense of "state" or "common to all the people." It will be public ownership and moreover assume various forms: cooperative, share, and mixed ownership—with the participation of foreign capital or foreign firms.

Then, in the actual system of distribution, although differentiation, it is clear, will be intensified, it will not, I think, assume the scale that is characteristic, for example, of the United States today. The average annual wage of an American worker comes to around $25,000, while the average wage of an American manager is $700,000-800,000 per year.

[Novikov] However, it should not be forgotten that the average wage of an American worker does all the same ensure a higher standard of living than does the average wage of a Soviet worker. The joke that "America is divided into the rich and the very rich" does contain a good deal of truth.

[Bogomolov] Undoubtedly so. If we apply a more or less realistic dollar-ruble rate—in shopping basket terms—the average wage of an American worker is equivalent to roughly $100,000 per year, that is to say, a monthly wage of R8,000-9,000. A vast difference! But there is another question. The low level of wages in our country is also the result of the Stalinist social system, when as a consequence of the policy then the correlation between surplus and necessary labor in our country was most unfavorable for working people. That is to say, after accomplishing the October Revolution we did not reduce the degree of exploitation but intensified it many times over compared with Western countries. This is demonstrated by the correlation in our social product between heavy industry sectors and those producing consumer goods. This is the chief and fundamental shortcoming of our economy and the basic brake on perestroyka and social progress in general, because to underpay people on such a gigantic scale is tantamount to robbing labor of incentives and blocking off every route to increasing the quality and productivity of that labor.

But I nevertheless want to say that such extreme differences will clearly not exist in a genuinely socialist society.

The question of power remains central. Certainly the ruling group of people in modern society, irrespective of whether that society is socialist or capitalist, has to act as a defender of not only its own group and class interests but the interests of the entire society, otherwise in conditions where sufficient democracy exists these people will be simply unable to count on being elected. But even as a representative of nationwide interests, this group does, nevertheless, defend its own interests first and foremost. And since in Western countries the same representatives of the most prosperous strata of society are in power, this stamps the nature of policy. There will, I think, be far more representation of the broad masses of the population in socialist countries, and in this sense the nature of power will be different. Although here, too, there are considerable dangers, which we have encountered in past periods, when a new class arises, as it were: Out of the representatives of the people a narrow group of rulers governed by their own self-interest forms over time.

So one cannot speak of the restoration of capitalism in Poland or Hungary. There will, of course, be differences. A society which is dissimilar to its predecessor but which is also distinct from what exists in a number of other countries, Western countries, for example, will arise in those countries. Although, I repeat, society in Western countries, too, is very heterogeneous: There is Swedish and Austrian "socialism." And perhaps these quotation marks should be removed... Perhaps this is precisely the only realistic way of implementing many socialist ideas—without utopianism and illusion—in present-day conditions.

[Novikov] You have just described what true socialism should be like, that is to say, you have outlined the imaginary ideal state which we would like to see. But perhaps we should stop experimenting and starting from scratch "according to the original plan"—these experiments have cost us too dearly! Why reinvent the wheel when it has not only been invented but built? You yourself have just talked about Swedish and Austrian socialism without quotation marks...

[Bogomolov] You are absolutely right: We are fed up to the teeth with the numerous theoretical constructs which have always been presented as the sole truth.

In this sense, all social modeling is very dangerous because we start off with some blueprint and stereotype and then start to make life fit it instead of deriving the objectives from actual life. So while speaking about certain attributes of what we should be striving for, I in no way wanted to give the impression that there is already some kind of consummate, absolutely true concept which it is proposed be immediately implemented. No, I am talking about something else. After all, when you encounter the problem of unemployment in the West and see it for the undoubted social disaster that it is, then your mind inevitably starts thinking about a superior society in which this evil would not exist. When you encounter differentiation where poverty and enormous wealth coexist, you realize that in an ideal society this should not be. That is to say, some guidelines are derived from today's contradictions. How all this will look in practice we can only imagine today in the broadest outlines, perhaps sometimes only as a vector, but not at all as any kind of clearly delineated goal.

I think that it is time to rehabilitate a phrase of Eduard Bernstein's which we have anethamatized: "The ultimate goal counts for nothing, movement is all!" It is precisely forward movement that is most important of all for us today: in labor productivity, technical progress, enhancing the population's technical standards, meeting the population's material, cultural, and other requirements, achieving greater freedom, exercising civil and human rights... Progress in all these spheres is movement toward socialism, because this represents social progress, and all progress, according to our theory, should go in the direction of socialism.

[Novikov] I don't know whether you will agree with me, but it seems to me that our fear of... words greatly impedes this forward movement. We are afraid of words more than anything else in in the world, in my opinion, and the reason for this is the hardened stereotypes which fairly often triumph over common sense. For example, when we talk about capitalism (and I thoroughly agree with you!), we conjure up the realities of 150 years ago. We patriotically shudder at the word "unemployment," unaware, for example, that in the Canadian city of

Calgary unemployment benefit is 2.5 times greater than the wage of a Soviet specialist working there. "Private property" is yet another such bugaboo...

[Bogomolov] I can only concur with what you say and refer you to my article in KOMMUNIST (issue No 11), where I try precisely to restore the rights of private ownership. And to describe real phenomena you should not have to seek a suitable euphemism each time so that you get "labor conflicts" instead of strikes, "imbalance" instead of inflation and breakdown of the domestic market, and "ownership by citizens" or "ownership by a labor production unit" instead of "private ownership." Private ownership is completely compatible with socialism, in my view, because we should approach the assessment of processes from the standpoint of real analysis rather than speculative and dogmatic positions.

It is naive to think that that it is possible to abolish private ownership and in so doing provide all the various goods and services that modern man enjoys, say, in Western countries, because the form of ownership is determined, in particular, by the degree of concentration of productive forces, and the degree of concentration is very varied. We have the utterly primitive notion that only large-scale industry and, consequently, only large-scale economic units equate to socialism and progress. In actual fact the number of small, even very small enterprises is growing in the modern world—in the United States there are almost 20 million of them and no American could take a single step without them. For example, he goes to have a snack in a bar or diner belonging to a single family. And if you abandon it and replace it with state forms, you'll have the kind of public catering which we have now, the like of which probably does not exist in any country in the world save our own! Someone who is hungry goes out and is unable to satify his hunger or thirst immediately. And the lack of services we suffer from and our inflexible production? After all, the range of goods produced in our country is certainly immeasurably narrower than in any modern Western society. We are ignorant of the names of thousands of convenient and necessary items enjoyed in the West. Why? The reason is that we do not have small enterprises—which are very responsive, react quickly to everything that is happening in the world, and know how to adapt. We have banked on gigantic units, which now have to be broken up into smaller units.

We have yet another dogma: Hired labor necessarily equals exploitation. Why? Incidentally, we do have hired labor in our country—at state enterprises—and it is also often accompanied by exploitation. Because if you pay a doctor who daily performs highly complex operations R150, that is clearly out of line with the expenditure of labor. That is one form of exploitation.

But why should hired labor in principle mean exploitation? If there is state monitoring, tax systems are developed, rules of calculation are firmly established, and the country has systems of social safeguards and social provision, hired labor does not at all presuppose exploitation. Take private enterprises, for example—whether in Hungary or Poland—the workers there earn much more that in state enterprises. Good heavens! You might expect the contrary: That they would be thoroughly exploited there, but they earn three to four times more. So it would be a good thing if we ditched that dogma, too. I have no doubt that public ownership will be the leading form in socialist countries, but private, individual ownership and hired labor must also be recognized.

[Novikov] I came across an idea articulated in the press recently which sums up our conversation. What it boils down to is that the forms of ownership themselves—the market, money, or the forms of power—do not create either socialism or capitalism. They are an instrument, a "vehicle," and the important thing is who sits behind the wheel and who distributes the final product. That is what perhaps we should be directing our main attention to: It is the producer and creator who should distribute public wealth.

## Economic

### Prospects for Free Economic Zones Viewed

*PM2510100389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2*

["Topical Dialogue" with Academician O. Bogomolov, USSR people's deputy and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, and Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Bykov, chief of a section at the institute, by O. Mikheyev in Moscow: "Free Zones"—no date of discussion given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] Academician O. Bogomolov, USSR people's deputy and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, and Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Bykov, chief of sector at the institute, reply to our correspondent's questions on this topic.

[Mikheyev] Do you think that the national economy really needs "joint enterprise zones?"

[Bogomolov] In my opinion, we need greater openness for the Soviet economy and its broader involvement in the system of world economic ties. But this requires "windows" opening on that world of tough competition, it requires a school to be attended by our production cadres.

[Mikheyev] How will our free zones differ from those created in China, for example?

[Bogomolov] These zones will create greater opportunities for the USSR than they did for China: We have a higher level of technological development and cadre training and a greater scientific headstart.

On the whole, China's experience is very instructive. Essentially, the country's entire eastern seaboard has been turned into a belt of intensive foreign economic activity, with special economic zones serving as bridgeheads. China managed to create these zones in 3-4 years, and in 6-7 years they have built huge new cities like Shenzhen, right next to Hong Kong.

At the same time, such zones in our country will clearly not be closed enclaves like in China, facing only outward. They would rather become bridges between the foreign and domestic markets.

[Bykov] We are studying not only China's, but the whole world's experience in open zones. There are more than 400 of them, including even some in the United States. I recently visited Ireland to study the experience of the zone at Shannon Airport, which has already been in existence for 30 years. Adjoining it is a more recent technology zone based on the local university. I arrived at the conclusion that the Shannon zone is helping a country, underdeveloped until quite recently, to rapidly build up its economic, scientific, and technical potential.

[Mikheyev] According to all indications, the specialization and orientation of zones will depend largely on their location. The underpopulated Far East with its vast raw material resources is one thing, but the Baltic or Black Sea regions are something quite different.

[Bogomolov] Yes, of course. Free zones in the Far East—in the Posyeta Bay, Nakhodka, and Sovetskaya Gavan regions or on Sakhalin Island, for example—could be based on Western technologies supplemented by ours, and could be geared toward the extraction and processing of natural resources. This would require larger investments to develop the infrastructure. Zones in the country's western part will be technologically oriented and will require smaller development funds, seeing that industry, cities, and transportation are already there. But differences will exist there as well. Zones in the Leningrad and Kaliningrad regions and in the Baltic republics will evidently become high-tech centers implementing the best Soviet scientific and technological developments. Zones in the region of Odessa and some other southern port cities could be comprehensive, offering industrial, transportation and shipping, and resort facilities. The important point is not to treat them all identically and to give the utmost consideration to local conditions.

[Mikheyev] Where specifically will the first free enterprise zones appear? What is the essence of your proposals?

[Bogomolov] Newspapers and television recently reported that a decision had been made to set up such zones in the Vyborg, Novgorod, and Nakhodka regions. Makhodka is of great interest to both local authorities and foreign partners, especially South Koreans. In my view, the territory near the border with Finland is most appropriate and most suitable for rapid development. It is possible to locate there ecologically clean production units, based on Soviet high technology, to make electronic products, laser equipment, computers, and timber and chemical industry equipment. After all, Leningrad—a major scientific and industrial center—is right next door.

[Bykov] Let me add that the Finnish side is also interested in this project. Finland will be given an opportunity to expand its market and effect major investments.

[Bogomolov] Work is also being done on the question of creating zones not far from Odessa and Sochi. I think that these could be of interest to a number of Mediterranean countries like Italy, France, and Spain. These countries are advancing, their economies are developing fast, and they have many enterprising people and impressive capital resources. These and other free zones on the USSR's European territory could also become a sphere for the application of joint efforts by CEMA countries.

Incidentally, Novgorod's example shows that zones can be created not only in the country's outlying coastal regions but also in the hinterland. Including the vicinity of Moscow—in Zelenograd or Kaliningrad, for example—similar to the way specialized scientific and technical zones are being created in Central China, in Beijing and other major cities.

[Mikheyev] In your view, what ought to be the principles and conditions governing the functioning of free zones?

[Bogomolov] Obviously, these zones must be self-governing territories. For this purpose, it is necessary to organize their own territorial administration on a sufficiently democratic basis under local authorities with minimum influence by central bureaucracy. Western partners fear our bureaucracy more than anything else. In conditions of regional economic accountability, oblasts or republics ought to earn some revenue from the zones, maybe in the form of lease payments to be made by foreign capital for use of the land, highways, ports, power, and so on.

The center should provide only a general framework, principles on which the zones function, acceptance or rejection of proposals originating at local level. Let all matters within the zone be decided by the zone itself in cooperation with local organs. For this purpose it ought to have some sort of administrative-economic management corporation which should be Soviet but including foreign elements, operating flexibly and adapting as much as possible to world market standards. It ought to recruit skilled people capable of working, as well as people who have ideas and know how to implement them but are unable to do so in our conditions.

[Bykov] The competition system could help in stopping the flow of people's favorite relatives, friends, or simply thieves and speculators who, as the Chinese experience shows, will probably pour in there in search of easy money.

[Bogomolov] Let me say that one of the first difficulties in setting up free zones will be caused by the huge gap separating the skills, standards, and labor intensiveness to which our workers are accustomed and the Western standards. Many will essentially have to learn from scratch how to work, how to attain a different standard of production and even a different attitude to work.

I would like readers to clearly understand this: Joint enterprise zones are in no way deals involving Soviet soil. It will remain ours, but it will become more open to broad collaboration with the world economy.

[Mikheyev] What currency regime will prevail in the zones? What money will be changing hands and be used in settlement?

[Bogomolov] Our position is that some sort of new Soviet currency, different from that used in the rest of the USSR, should circulate in free zones in parallel with hard western currency. It may be something similar to now-abolished "Berezka" checks, or vouchers of some kind, a kind of substitute hard currency. It need not necessarily be fully convertible. Or it might be some sort of new convertible ruble like Lenin's Chervonets.

The idea is to introduce another ruble in parallel with the conventional domestic ruble, a ruble which will gradually, with the passage of time, evolve into a hard convertible currency. It will initially be introduced in these zones, and later the sphere of its use will expand step by step, including its use in international settlements.

This new Soviet currency must be created in one way or another. Whether we like it or not, Western partners will operate only in conditions to which they are accustomed. The minimum requirements are realistic prices comparable to world prices and a realistic exchange rate for the Soviet ruble.

[Mikheyev] Will the zones recoup the considerable expenditure incurred to create them? When could they be expected to produce returns?

[Bykov] If we wish to attract Western capital, we will have to incur considerable expenditure on allocating and developing the zones' territory and building up their infrastructure. Expenditure is inevitable, but it is not beyond our reach. On the whole, these zones must, of course, pay for themselves. But there will be no immediate manna from heaven, as the Chinese found out for themselves.

[Bogomolov] Generally speaking, there are periods when this kind of zone spends more foreign currency than it earns. We must be prepared for this in order to avoid switching from one extreme to another, from illusion to disappointment. All this constitutes a stage we must go through, patiently accumulating a different but equally important "currency"—experience of work in conditions of world markets and international production standards.

[Mikheyev] The scientists' viewpoint on the problem is clear. But how will matters develop in practice?

[Bogomolov] It is difficult to produce forecasts, and everything happens very slowly in our country. A special law on these zones and a mass of new legal norms need to be adopted, to introduce clarity in all circumstances, offering the Western partners a guarantee of the serious and irreversible nature of our intentions.

The main difficulty is that so far it is unclear how interested Western capital is in such investments.

In other cases, there is no clarity as regards the economic benefit accruing to Western investors: What will be their specific gain from capital investment, to what extent will their marketing expand in the Soviet Union? This uncertainty is holding them back. Even though there will probably be some who would run a certain risk so that, looking further into the future, they could establish themselves here, "stake out" certain positions, and only then seriously expand the marketing of their products in the USSR. We really will be purchasing part of the output of enterprises being created in the zones for the domestic market.

A lot here will depend on the irreversibility and pace of perestroyka in our country, primarily in the economy, on how swiftly and how successfully our domestic market takes shape. Pioneering partners in our open zones will evidently not have an easy time initially, but in exchange they will enjoy the best opportunities in the future.

## Economic Conference Continues, Attendees Listed

*PM2410110289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A conference of the country's leading economists took place at the CPSU Central Committee on 23 October, with the participation of USSR people's deputies and leaders of a number of central economic departments, associations, and enterprises. The economic situation in the country and ways of surmounting difficulties in the national economy were discussed.

The conference was conducted by M.S. Gorbachev.

The speakers were S.S. Alekseyev, USSR people's deputy, director of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences Urals Department, and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician V.V. Laptev, section chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law; P.G. Bunich, USSR people's deputy, professor at the S. Ordzhonikidze Moscow Institute of Management, and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Professor G.A. Yegiazaryan, faculty chief at Moscow State Unviersity and doctor of economic sciences; N.Ya. Petrakov, USSR people's deputy, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economic-Mathematical Institute, and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician S.S. Shatalin, section chief at the Industrial Economics Institute of NTP [expansion unknown in this context; possibly "Scientific and Technical Progress"] of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Doctor of Economic Sciences N.P. Shmelev, USSR people's deputy and section chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences ISK [expansion unknown]; Academician I.I. Lukinov, vice president of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences and director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute; Doctor of Economic Sciences R.A. Otsason, deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers; A.G. Aganbegyan, rector of the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy and academician secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department; M.A. Bocharov, USSR people's deputy and director of the Butovo Construction Materials Combine; Professor A.A. Sobchak, USSR people's deputy, faculty chief at Leningrad State University, and doctor of legal sciences; A.S. Samsonov, USSR people's deputy and general director of the First Clocks and Watches Plant; M.L. Bronshteyn, USSR people's deputy, faculty chief at Tartu University, and academician of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences; and Yu.V. Yaremenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and Forecasting of Scientific and Technical Progress and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, and G.I. Usmanov took part in the meeting.

The conference will continue.

A report on the conference will be published in the press.

## Union of Managers Established, Elects Officials

*904A0026A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 p 2*

[Unattributed article: "Union of Managers Established"]

[Text] Opposing bureaucracy and the administrative-command system—this is the task business people of the Soviet Union have set for themselves, those who have united to form the USSR Union of Managers, an organization whose founding congress ends today. Present at the congress were 271 delegates from seven union republics. They include prominent scholars, managers of major industrial enterprises and associations, production directors and organizers of joint enterprises.

Speaking at the opening of the congress, Professor V. Groshev of the organizational committee, rector of the Moscow Plekhanov National Economics Institute, stated that the USSR Union of Managers is setting itself the task of creating favorable conditions for developing business activity and creative initiative for specialists and scholars in the sphere of industrial organization and management, commercial and enterprise activity.

The congress intends to introduce into its daily operation the organization of public expertise on major legislation regarding government and socioeconomic issues. Its management board will prepare conclusions based on this and, when necessary, offer alternatives.

During its first day in session, the congress drew up the statutes of the USSR Union of Managers and elected its president, Professor V. Groshev.

## Goskomstat Chairman Reviews Economic Situation

*LD1910230189 Moscow TASS in English 2246 GMT 19 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—The Soviet economic situation has been described as "very tense, complicated and contradictory" by Chairman of the State Committee for Statistics [Goskomstat] Vadim Kirichenko.

He was summing up the results of the Soviet economic performance in the first nine months of this year in an interview with the Soviet television on Thursday night.

At the same time, Kirichenko noted that the new economic mechanism has already made itself felt. The number of enterprises and organizations operating on a lease contract basis has considerably increased. The growth rate in this group of enterprises amounts to 7 percent, while the industrial average has not gone higher than 2.2 per cent.

The rate of economic growth in the country as a whole has gone down. The output of many products, including consumer goods, was below the level for the same period last year.

The consumer market situation has not been stabilized. Rationing has been expanded.

The Goskomstat chairman noted that the key disproportion in the economy has not yet been overcome—labour and material resources are still predominantly concentrated in the area of production of the means of production.

The volume of consumer goods has increased by around 15 billion rubles in the past 9 months, much less than planned. The volume of foodstuffs produced went up by 3.2 per cent. Goskomstat estimates show that 10 million tonnes more grain will be harvested this year than in the previous one.

The growth of incomes is presently 1.3 times greater than the outlays of the population for goods and services, Kirichenko reported.

He said that income regulation and other drastic, even if unpopular measures were the only keys to rectify the otherwise unmanageable situation.

### Demidov Criticizes Food Shortages in Moscow

*904D0013A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Oct 89 p 1*

[Article by D. Demidov: "Spinning Wheels Again...."]

[Text] Recently, we have been able to witness emptiness in the meat, dairy, and even grocery and bread departments of the capital city stores which until recently furnished goods for the Muscovites and visitors, albeit far from abundant. What is going on? A TRUD correspondent went to a meeting of the headquarters for supplying Moscow with foodstuffs which was held in the building of the Moscow Soviet in order to respond to this question.

It is virtually impossible for someone who is not privy to the nuances of commerce to immediately comprehend the essence of the problem. However, we did manage to find out certain things.

As some of those taking the floor said, Moscow has not faced a situation that difficult ever before. There is a shortage of virtually everything. The reaction of customers to disruptions in meat sales is the sharpest. In the past 2 weeks, virtually every day dozens of stores were left without this product. For example, on 14 October, 88 shops were left without meat at all, 221 were left without beef, and 323 without pork. Boiled sausage was not brought to 163 stores. On 20 October, customers left 58 stores without purchasing meat. Failures by suppliers outside the capital city to comply with delivery plans for meat products are one of the main causes of the disruptions.

The situation with macaroni products and flour is no better. For example, on 14 and 15 October, 154 stores in Moscow were left without pancake flour. However, it is the unstable operation of Moscow bakery plants that is most alarming. If all short deliveries of bread products for the past year were to be summed up, they would be equal to all the stores of the capital city failing to sell bread altogether for a day. This year, an equivalent of 3 days in deliveries not made has already been accumulated.

It would seem that the rationing of sugar sales should have eliminated the problem with this product. Nonetheless, in the past 2 weeks days have happened when one bakery in four was out of sugar....

This enumeration of sad examples can go on. This will not make the situation better. A legitimate question arises—was it altogether impossible to predict the onset of shortages? After all, this is something worse now than a shortage of detergents.... Had a correct projection been made ahead of time, appropriate measures could have been taken and the present situation would have been averted.

Another aspect also gives rise to concern. It is understandable that the presence or absence of foodstuffs on the counters of the capital city is the result of the operation or disruptions in a most complex economic mechanism. It depends on the coordination of work of many industries, enterprises which produce, haul, store, and sell products. These organizations are headed by quite specific people whom the Muscovites have to thank for it. These are the very people who are now entrusted with rectifying the situation.

Undoubtedly, some of them will be penalized to a degree. However, would it not be more logical to select the cadre of ranking functionaries more carefully ahead of time so that they would not make a multitude of people work on a shock-work schedule later in order to correct the mistakes caused by their incompetence?

### Gosbank Begins Issuing Credit Cards

*LD2110224689 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 21 Oct 89*

[Text] The Soviet State Saving Bank has been issuing credit cards called "electric money." It has introduced a network of electronic equipment in Moscow similar to that used in the American Express and Visa systems. As electronic money spreads to the rest of the Soviet Union it will save it several billion rubles a year currently spent on the (?emission), control and storage of paper money.

### Promising New Gas Field Discovered in Turkmenistan

*LD2110130689 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 0245 GMT 16 Oct 89*

[Text] A promising new field in the east of the Karakum has been discovered by specialists of the Turkmengeologiya production association. In the Vostochnoye Erdekli area, a commercial flow of natural gas was obtained from a depth of almost 3 km. The yield of the well is over 600,000 cubic meters of gas per day. Prospecting and exploratory work is continuing here now, and several more wells are being sunk.

## Scientific

### 'Meteor-3' Meteorological Satellite Launched

*LD2510094689 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 25 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—A Meteor-3 meteorological satellite was orbited in the USSR today by a Cyclon carrier-rocket. It is designed to improve the meteorological service and to check information and measuring instruments, methods of remote-sounding the atmosphere and the earth's surface for economic and scientific purposes.

The satellite has an initial rotation period of 109.5 minutes, maximum distance from the earth's surface of 1,228 kilometres, minimum distance of 1,191 kilometres, and an orbital inclination of 82.6 degrees.

It carries optical-mechanical scanning television and radio-metrical equipment and geophysical instrumentation.

The satellite's equipment is functioning normally.

The gathered data is transmitted for processing and use to hydrometeorological centre of the USSR, to the state natural resources research centre and to autonomous data receiving states of the state hydrometeorological committee.

### 'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Space Flight 24 Oct

*LD2410185589 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 24 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow, October 24 TASS—TASS correspondent reports from the Mission Control Centre:

Cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksnadr Serebrov started a working day on board the Mir orbital complex with medical checks. The cosmonauts measured the mass of their bodies and made a number of experiments for appraisal of man's psychophysiological reactions in conditions of space flight.

Using MKS-M and Spectrum-256 apparatuses, the cosmonauts are carrying out a cycle of meaasurements of characteristics of the spectrum of the earth's atmosphere, specifically of its ozone layer in the tropic zone. This work is part of the Atlantica-89 comprehensive international Soviet-Cuban project.

Photography using the the glazar ultraviolet telescope is planned for the afternoon. This photography is envisaged by the programme of research into space astronomy. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian in a report at 0500 GMT on 24 October adds: "For the first time in the flight of the fifth main expedition on the station, ultraviolent ray photographs will be taken of individual sectors of the celestial sky using the Glazar telescope. These experiments are being conducted for an international project; specialists from Switzerland are working with the Soviet scientists."]

Telemetric information and the cosmonauts' reports show that the flight proceeds normally. The cosmonauts feel well.

### Booster Rocket Testing Scheduled for Pacific Area

*LD2210114489 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 22 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The launchings of booster rockets will be carried out in the Soviet Union in the period of October 26 to November 4 to the Pacific Ocean areas limited as follows:

By a circumference with a radius of 30 nautical miles and with the centre having these coordinates: 39 degrees 45 minutes, northern latitude, 169 degrees 55 minutes, eastern longitude, and 27 degrees 00 minutes, northern latitude, 173 degrees 00 minutes eastern longitude.

For the purpose of ensuring security, the Soviet Government requests the governments of other states using sea and air lanes in the pacific to instruct appropriate bodies that sea and air craft should not call at those areas and air space over them every day between 8:00 and 16:30 local time.

## Military

### New Union To Provide Social Aid to Servicemen

*LD2110221589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 21 Oct 89*

[Text] The new public organization "Shchit" [Shield] is being set up in our country. It is a union for the social protection of servicemen, persons liable for military service, and their families. Our correspondent Kiril Shakhnovich visited the congress of this union, which opened today. Here is a recording of a conversation he had with a member of the organizing committee of the union "Shchit," (Mikhail Sergeyevich Semokhov):

[Begin recording] [Shakhnovich] Mikhail Sergeyevich, your organization is called "Shchit." What is this "shield" for? What questions will you raise in your organization? What problems will you be tackling?

[(Semokhov)] An Army structure has been created which does not provide reliable social protection for servicemen. The problems which now exist in the Army, above all regarding social protection, are so acute that they create social tension in the Army. They are destabilizing it, and correspondingly destabilizing the battle readiness of the Armed Forces. In connection with this, the officers who have gathered—senior officers with greater experience than mine, and junior officers, and there are also private soldiers and members of their families....

[Shakhnovich, interrupting] So it is not just officers of the reserve. Today at the congress there are, for example, many serving military personnel.

[(Semokhov)] Yes, 50 percent are serving officers, and 50 percent are reserve officers. I want to emphasize that it is the professional officers, regular officers, who have raised this problem. These are the officers who have themselves experienced all the hardships that unfortunately exist and are not being solved.

[Shakhnovich] It seems to me that your organization can help to restructure the Ministry of Defense. That will be a real help.

[(Semokhov)] Our union has a great many points of contact with the Defense Ministry. So there is no doubt that in the future our paths will converge. The union is being created precisely for the purpose of working together with the Defense Ministry to help it seek out and try to solve the problems which the leadership of the ministry cannot tackle directly, for whatever reason. Our union is setting itself the task of creating, primarily, a professional union of servicemen.

[Shakhnovich] Let us widen the gamut of problems. What particular problems might you be able to solve?

[(Semokhov)] The range of problems is very wide. We will approach them gradually. At the moment we are tackling specifically, say, the problem of the Afghanistan veterans. Just in our own Kalininskiy Rayon, we are setting up a medical center where we will be treating the sick—including veterans of the Great Fatherland War, not just those from Afghanistan—free of charge. We are setting up an evening kindergarten. In principle we are willing, and intend, to generalize the experience that has already been amassed not only among us, but also in other organizations that are now being created everywhere. For instance, we are in touch with the public organization "VCh"—"Voyennosluzhashchiy Chelovek' [Serviceman] which has been set up in Latvia. There are similar structures in other parts of the Soviet Union, and they have already accumulated a certain amount of experience. The union is going to generalize that experience and publicize it. [end recording]

## Army Deputies' Group Holds First Meeting

*PM2310121589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 89 First Edition p 1*

[Own correspondents Captain 1st Rank V. Lukashevich, Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev report on session of USSR Armed Forces deputies' group: "From Dialogue to Taking up a Stance"]

[Text] From the first day of the work of the Congress of People's Deputies we have gotten used to seeing people in austere military uniform mounting the parliamentary rostrum, the highest rostrum in the country. The 82 people's deputies from the Armed Forces, whose fate was very close to all our hearts during the election campaign, and to whom those of us who had the opportunity gave our votes, represent a solid corps of deputies. They represent hundreds of thousands of voters—workers, peasants, and members of the intelligentsia—whose interests the military deputies have to uphold both at the Congress and at Supreme Soviet sessions. However, since they had been nominated in the main by military collectives, since Army and Navy servicemen gave them their votes, and lastly since they themselves are wearing epaulets, the interests of the Armed Forces must not come last for these people's deputies.

This, in particular, was discussed at the first session of the servicemen deputies' group, held 20 October at the Soviet Army Central House named for M.V. Frunze. In his opening speech USSR People's Deputy Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, announced that the session was being attended by 71 deputies. Many deputies had earlier expressed the wish to form such a group and more than 200 proposals concerning the organization of this group and its work had been received.

After the agenda was approved, Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, delivered a report to the deputies. He briefed them on the results of the session of the USSR Defense Council Main Military Council of 18 October 1989 and the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretry of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Defense Council.

At the request of those present, Army General D.T. Yazov told them about his trip to the United States at the invitation of that country's secretary of defense.

The floor was then given to Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, for his report on the problems of perestroyka in the Armed Forces and on the condition of and the main spheres for development in the Armed Forces. He also briefed the people's deputies on progress in compiling the draft law "On the Defense of the USSR" and other legislative acts.

Those who addressed the session noted that the deputies from the Armed Forces require this kind of information from the Armed Forces' top leaders to be able to form competent opinions on the progress of perestroyka in the Army and Navy and to understand the problems of military building, questions of servicemen's social provision, and other issues which they have to deal with in their work as deputies.

Major General M.S. Surkov dwelled in his speech on the responsibility which attaches to deputies' statements. There is a certain category of deputies, he said, who have been working in Moscow for a long time. They take the liberty to speak on behalf of the entire Armed Forces, at times displaying disrespect for the Army and personal incompetence. Every one of us must feel responsible for the statements he makes, either in parliament, at a meeting with voters, at a rally, or in the press. After all, every deputy is a statesman. I hope, the speaker said, that our group will contribute to the deputies' adoption of a comprehensively balanced stance.

The effectiveness of the group's work, Lieutenant Colonel V.I. Alksnis said, will depend largely on the sort of atmosphere which we create. If there is democracy and the opportunity to freely express viewpoints, then our work will be useful. He then dwelt on the situation which has taken shape in the Baltic republics. Attempts are continuing in the course of the republic and local soviet election campaign to deprive servicemen of their electoral rights or to restrict those rights. A complicated situation has also developed as regards the fall draft into the Army. A number of unofficial organizations are demanding that all young men drafted into the Army there be allowed to serve on the territory of the Baltic republics.

Colonel V. Martirosyan complained in his speech that his participation in the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka—"Rukh"—is being misinterpreted by the press, and, specifically, in an article published in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA which, as he put it, is undermining his authority. Frankly, it is difficult to agree with this claim. The newspaper's article ("Which Flag Over Our Home?" of 7 October this year) contained no comment on Colonel Martirosyan's speech, as readers will remember. We confined ourselves to quotes only from Vilen Arutyunovich's speech at the constituent congress. In this case, who is undermining whose authority? The speaker also criticized political officers, noting that during his career he has come across few good political officers. In conclusion he expressed confidence that the establishment of the deputies' group will make it possible for the deputies from the Armed Forces to organize themselves and jointly seek and find answers to the complex questions with which life is confronting them.

Deputy Yu.Yu. Sokolova expressed the view that many of her deputy colleagues will have to learn to speak more clearly and persuasively from congress and session rostrums and to argue their points more cogently. In her opinion, the work of the new deputies' group will promote this. She proposed that the question of press coverage of the topic of the defense of the Fatherland be raised in the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, and she called for a resolute rebuttal of attempts to devalue Soviet people's lasting moral values and, at the same time, for greater tolerance of comradely criticism backed by steps toward consolidation, dialogue, and constructiveness in parliamentary work.

Lieutenant Colonel N.S. Petrushenko spoke about the need to provide deputies with more opportunities to state their views on the pages of military publications. He called on representatives of the Armed Forces to take a more active part in the preparation and holding of the local soviet elections, to display great initiative and enterprise in this sphere, and to avoid the sad mistakes which occurred during the nomination of candidates for USSR people's deputyships.

Major K.A. Kharchenko dwelt on questions pertaining to the organization of the deputies' work, and in particular the problems which they encounter daily when meeting with voters, gathering information, and trying to disseminate the necessary materials. In his opinion the solution of these problems is being hampered by a lack of coordination in terms of some provisions contained in the relevant normative documents.

The sessions of our group, provided that they take place regularly once a quarter or if and when nececessary, Admiral V.P. Ivanov, commander of the Baltic Fleet, said, will make it possible to achieve a unity of opinions and expand our knowledge. However, this is not enough today for a deputy, especially a military deputy. He must assimilate parliamentary standards and combine military ethics with respect for other people's viewpoints and correct behavior.

The admiral emphasized the need to enhance the role of political officers in the course of perestroyka. I am a regular officer, he said. I have been in the Navy since I was 15 and I appreciate the value of political organs. Yet some people, even among the military and the deputies, are trying to discredit them.

Problems pertaining to deputies' work were also raised by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, Colonel V.N. Ochirov, Senior Lieutenant N.D. Tutov, and other speakers.

Summing up the exchange of opinions, Army General A.D. Lizichev noted with satisfaction that the deputies had engaged in a serious and useful dialogue. I believe, he said, that this should continue to be the case in the future. Everything that has been raised by the people's deputies will be studied most attentively and taken into account. Obviously, you will agree that our common objective is to ensure a consistent and principled stance on questions affecting the Army and its prestige and place in Soviet society. While working hard and with commitment, we must respect each other, be patient and tolerant, learn to listen to and hear others, and display great responsibility.

A five-member council was elected at the deputies' group session. Major General of Aviation P.I. Klimuk, Colonel A.V. Tselko, and Captain E.S. Gams are its co-chairmen, and Colonel General N.V. Kalinin and Major O.A. Bochkov are council members.

## Meeting With Afghan Veterans' Widows, Mothers

*PM2410134389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 First Edition p 1*

[Own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik report: "Unpayable Debt"]

[Text] Hero of the Soviet Union Army General V.I. Vareanikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, has received members of the Moscow council of the mothers and widows of internationalist servicemen killed while carrying out their military duty in afghanistan.

This was the first time a "roundtable" meeting of representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry and the Moscow council of mothers and widows had been held.

"Through you the USSR Defense Ministry sends all mothers and widows of dead 'Afghan' servicemen its gratitude for educating worthy sons of the fatherland," Army Gen V. Varennikov said in his speech. "We bow before their sacred memory. Our military internationalists' feats are well known—they spilled their sweat and blood in carrying out the motherland's orders. Now the motherland should carry out its duty to them—20-year-old war veterans, and the mothers, widows, and families of those who were killed, died from their wounds, or are missing in action in Afghanistan. Unfortunately," Army Gen V. Varennikov stressed, "neither the country nor the capital has a single authoritative organization which, in line with the law, could defend the interests of 'Afghan' servicemen and ensure social protection for mothers, widows, and all the families of servicemen killed on Afghan soil. That is why it is planned in the near future to set up appropriate organs in order to solve all urgent problems in the structure of the USSR Defense Ministry. A number of other measures are being taken. In particular, it has been decided to publish in 1990-1991 a remembrance book containing the names of all servicemen killed in Afghanistan, their biographical data, descriptions of their feats, and details of their deaths in order to perpetuate the memory of those killed in Afghanistan on a nationwide scale. The names of the fallen will not be forgotten!"

Many sad facts and figures were cited at the meeting. The war in Afghanistan touched many cities and villages, and did not pass Moscow by. Some 18,000 Muscovites and inhabitants of the Moscow area served in Afghanistan. Of these, 540 were killed or died from their wounds, 14 are missing in action, and 377 were left as invalids as a result of wounds, contusions, and disease. Behind each of these sad statistics lies an actual person and his difficult fate. The grief of the mothers and widows cannot be assuaged, but it is exacerbated—and this was bitterly noted by many speakers—when "Afghans" and the families of those who were killed or are missing in action meet with indifference and complacency when it comes to the granting of the privileges stipulated by law. Suffice it to say that in Moscow Oblast only 20 percent of needy "Afghans" have received any improvement in their housing conditions. Less than 10 percent of their apartments have telephones. Moreover, the granite headstones stipulated by law have still not been erected on certain graves.

During the frank and prolonged conversation between the members of the council of mothers and widows and representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry, the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee, the Moscow CPSU City Committee, and the Moscow City Soviet specific questions of the social protection afforded mothers, widows, and all the families of killed or missing "Afghans" were discussed along with questions of the material, consumer, and medical services available to them.

"We are pinning great hopes on today's meeting at the USSR Defense Ministry," Galina Mikhaylovna Magonova, member of the council of mothers and widows, told me. "It's hard talking about this, but our supposed privileges often have to be wangled out of local authorities and rayon military commissariats. The time has come to place the families of all those internationalist servicemen who were killed or injured in the Afghan war at the center of nationwide concern and attention."

## Internal Troops Lauded on Anniversary

*PM2010140389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 89 First Edition p 1*

[Report by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Party Fighters: USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Internal Troop Political Organs Are 70 Years Old"]

[Text] The internal troops can trace their origins back to the Smolnyy sentries and the first detachments of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission. Participation in the struggle against the White Guards, the liquidation of counterrevolutionary conspiracies and revolts, the guarding of important installations, and the fostering of revolutionary awareness and discipline in personnel dictated the need to create political organs in the troops, whose formation was completed 21 October 1919 with the establishment of the political administration of the republic's internal protection troops under the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission.

At all the stages of their history the troops vigilantly guarded October's gains. Their combat path is inseparable from the history of the Soviet state. The troops led the same life as the entire country. The mass repressions of the prewar years did not pass them by either. Suffice it to say that nine of the 12 chiefs of the political administration were subjected to repression.

During the Great Patriotic War years the commissars and political workers used impassioned party words and personal example to foster bravery and heroism in servicemen and fill their hearts with unshakable faith in victory over the enemy. In peacetime, too, the servicemen are at their combat post. They make a substantial contribution to the fight against crime in the country.

Internal troop units and subunits have proved that they are a real force capable of efficiently countering large-scale illegal actions and ensuring public order and the safety of citizens at the time of the events in Nagorno-Karabakh, Fergana, Abkhazia, Novyy Uzen, and other regions with a complex operational situation. Risking their lives, they shield peaceful residents with their chests, reliably protecting their constitutional rights and freedoms against criminal encroachments. During the Fergana Oblast events alone more than 150 servicemen suffered serious traumas and injuries. Future political workers—Militia Senior Lieutenant Viktor Novikov, a higher political school student, and Cadet Vladimir Akopov—died at the hands of extremists in Abkhazia.

Today political organs, party organizations, and communists in units and subunits are restructuring and improving party political work, directing it toward fostering lofty moral and combat qualities in servicemen, rallying multinational military collectives, and democratizing their life; and they are mobilizing personnel for the exemplary fulfillment of the tasks set for the internal troops.

## Further Details Cited on Caspian Plane Crash

*PM2010103389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1*

[Interview with First Deputy Commander in Chief of the Air Forces Ye. Shaposhnikov by special correspondent N. Belan under the "Fact and Commentary" rubric: "Crash Over the Sea"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Our special correspondent N. Belan asked Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Forces, to comment on what had occurred.

[Shaposhnikov] It is still too early to talk about the details, particularly the causes of the crash. However, An official commission did go immediately to the scene of the accident, which occurred Wednesday evening; so we are waiting for its conclusions. For the time being, we know the following: It was a scheduled flight by a military transport plane carrying 48 assault troops and 2 military transport engineers. A fire broke out in the area of the power units 3-4 minutes after takeoff, which was immediately reported to ground control. The crew set about fighting the fire and acted efficiently and bravely. They were unable, however, to put it out.

The flight controller decided to recall the plane to the airfield. On its landing approach, at a distance of approximately 6-7 km from the airfield, the plane went out of control. It rolled steeply to port and exploded when it hit the water (the tragedy occurred over the Caspian Sea).

[Belan] How much is known for certain, Yevgeniy Ivanovich, about the fate of the crew and passengers?

[Shaposhnikov] I would like to hope for the best. The search in the area of the Il-76 crash is still proceeding and, despite difficult weather conditions, is being conducted in the most thorough way. However, the results are not comforting.